

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE



Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools
of the Middle States and Maryland

1908

HELD AT FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27th and 28th, 1908

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

1909

UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
MAR 16 1909

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools
of the Middle States and Maryland

1908

HELD AT FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27th and 28th, 1908

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

1909

NOTICE

Extra copies of the Proceedings of the Association may be secured without charge from the Secretary by any officer of a College or School holding membership in the Association.

A charge of twenty-five cents per copy is made to those not members of the Association.

690-1-5-16-09
of the history of the state of Md. 5-16-09

CONTENTS

Officers of the Association.....	3
Summary of Sessions	5
Address of Welcome	7
<i>John S. Stahr</i>	
Response	
<i>James G. Croswell</i>	11
"A Review of the History and Work of the Association."	
<i>Julius Sachs</i>	13
"Can Students be Taught to Read Latin?"	
<i>Gonzalez Lodge</i>	27
General Discussion	
<i>Thomas Fell</i>	39
<i>Julius Sachs</i>	40
<i>Randall Spaulding</i>	42
<i>Gonzalez Lodge</i>	43
<i>Louis Bevier, Jr.</i>	45
<i>R. C. Schiedt</i>	46
"Are We Educating the Rising Generation?"	
(a) "The Individual and The System"	
<i>Lightner Witmer</i>	48
(b) "Some Famous English Schools."	
<i>James H. Canfield</i>	60
(c) "The Basis for College Education."	
<i>John G. Bowman</i>	72
General Discussion	
<i>Nathan C. Schaeffer</i>	80
<i>William V. Marcy</i>	81
<i>Ethelbert D. Warfield</i>	86
President's Address: "The One Thing Needful."	
<i>James G. Croswell</i>	86
Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College	
Entrance Certificate Board.....	103
<i>Edwin S. Crawley</i>	
General Discussion	
<i>Thomas Fiske</i>	106
<i>Edwin S. Crawley</i>	106
<i>Herbert W. Dutch</i>	107
<i>Julius Sachs</i>	107

General Discussion—Continued.

<i>Thomas Fell</i>	108
<i>Louis Bevier, Jr.</i>	109
<i>A. E. Gobble</i>	111
<i>Robert B. English</i>	113
<i>Wilson Farrand</i>	114

Report of the Committee of Twelve on the Quantity of College Entrance Examinations	<i>Wilson Farrand.</i>	116
--	------------------------	-----

General Discussion

<i>Louis Bevier, Jr.</i>	120
<i>Wilson Farrand</i>	121
<i>Julius Sachs</i>	122
<i>Murray P. Brush</i>	122
<i>Spencer Trotter</i>	123
<i>C. W. Prettyman</i>	124

Miscellaneous Business

Treasurer's Report	125
Report of the Executive Committee	127
Report of the Nominating Committee.....	128
Appointment of the Representatives of the Association on the College Entrance Certificate Board.....	129
Report of the Committee on Uniform Requirements in English	130
Report of the Delegate of the Association to the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools	132
Constitution of the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools	134
Report of the Delegates of the Association on the Commission to Revise the Definition of the Requirements for Entrance to College in Elementary Physics....	136
Appointment of the Representatives of the Association on the College Entrance Examination Board.....	138
Appointment of the Committee on Uniform Requirements in English	138

Officers of the Association, 1907-8.....	139
--	-----

Publications of the Association for 1908.....	140
---	-----

List of Members, 1908-9.....	142
------------------------------	-----

Delegates Registered, 1908	146
----------------------------------	-----

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1908-1909

President

President JAMES D. MOFFAT, Washington and Jefferson College,
Washington, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN S. STAHR, Franklin and Marshall College, Lan-
caster, Pa.

President JOHN H. FINLEY, College of the City of New York,
New York, N. Y.

Dean JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, University of Pennsylvania, Phila-
delphia, Pa.

Principal JOHN C. SHARPE, Blair Academy, Blairstown, N. J.

Director THOMAS S. BAKER, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.

Secretary

Professor ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Phila-
delphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Professor JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lan-
caster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary and Treasurer, ex-officio.

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New
York City.

Dean EDWARD H. GRIFFIN, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore,
Md.

Principal E. M. HARTMAN, Franklin and Marshall Academy,
Lancaster, Pa.

Principal JOHN H. DENBIGH, Morris High School, New York
City.

TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION
HELD AT FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, LANCASTER, PA.,
NOVEMBER 27-28, 1908.

SUMMARY OF SESSIONS

**First Session, Friday, November 27, at 10.30 A. M., in
the College Chapel**

Address of Welcome:

President JOHN S. STAHR, Franklin and Marshall College.

Response:

President JAMES G. CROSWELL, The Brearley School, New York City.

"A Review of the History and Work of the Association."

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

"Can Students Be Taught to Read Latin?"

Professor GONZALEZ LODGE, Columbia University.

General Discussion:

President THOMAS FELL, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

Superintendent RANDALL SPAULDING, Montclair, N. J.

Professor GONZALEZ LODGE, Columbia University.

Professor LOUIS BEVIER, JR., Rutgers College.

Professor R. C. SCHIEDT, Franklin and Marshall College.

**Second Session, Friday, November 28, at 2.30 P. M., in
the College Chapel**

Topic: "Are We Educating the Rising Generation?"

(a) "The Individual and the System," Professor LIGHTNER WITMER, University of Pennsylvania.

(b) "Some Famous English Schools," Dr. JAMES H. CANFIELD, Librarian of Columbia University.

(c) "The Basis for College Education," Mr. JOHN G. BOWMAN, Secretary of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

General Discussion:

Dr. NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAM N. MARCY, The Mackenzie School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

President ETHELBERT D. WARFIELD, Lafayette College.

**Third Session, Friday, November 27, at 8 P. M., in the
St. James Parish House**

President's Address: "The One Thing Needful."

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School,
New York City.

Reception tendered by the Faculty of Franklin and Marshall
College at the Iris Club.

**Fourth Session, Saturday, November 28, at 10 A. M., in
the College Chapel**

Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College
Entrance Certificate Board.

Professor EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, University of Pennsylvania.

General Discussion:

Professor THOMAS S. FISKE, Columbia University.

Professor EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, University of Pennsylvania.

Principal HERBERT W. DUTCH, Montclair High School,
Montclair, N. J.

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

President THOMAS FELL, St. John's College.

Professor LOUIS BEVIER, JR., Rutgers College.

Professor A. E. GOBBLE, Albright College.

Professor ROBERT B. ENGLISH, Washington and Jefferson
College.

Headmaster WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy, Newark,
N. J.

Report of the Committee of Twelve on the Quantity of College
Entrance Examinations.

Headmaster WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy, Newark,
N. J.

General Discussion:

Professor LOUIS BEVIER, JR., Rutgers College.

Headmaster WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy.

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

Professor MURRAY P. BRUSH, Johns Hopkins University.

Professor SPENCER TROTTER, Swarthmore College.

Professor C. W. PRETTYMAN, Dickinson College.

12 M. Business Meeting and Election of Officers.

PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
Twenty-second Annual Convention

FIRST SESSION,
Friday, November 27th, at 10.30 A. M.

President James G. Croswell Presiding.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

PRESIDENT JOHN S. STAHR, FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen: It affords me unusual pleasure to perform the agreeable duty which has been assigned to me, to welcome the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland to this, as it is called, their twenty-second annual meeting.

Twenty-one years ago—a little more than twenty-one years ago—this Association had its birth at this place; and we are glad now that you have come back to the place of your nativity. During the twenty-one years that have elapsed, a great many changes have taken place. This Association has grown from a small beginning to be a large and influential body. Some of us who were present at the birth of this Association remember very well, what I suppose is familiar history to most of you, how this Association came to be conceived and born.

President E. H. Magill, of Swarthmore College, interested in the cause of public education generally, and visiting a number of the colleges of the State in the interests of closer affiliation between colleges and the public schools, found that there was a growing sentiment among the colleges of the State to get more closely together; and particularly he and Rev. Thomas G. Apple, who was then president of Franklin and Marshall College, entered into correspondence and elaborated a scheme which they thought might be carried forward to achieve certain desired

ends—one of these being the question of the taxation of college property and the other the question of a closer affiliation between colleges and the public schools of the State.

Dr. Apple and Dr. Magill were instrumental in calling a meeting of college presidents at Harrisburg, in March, 1887; and, in consequence of the action taken at that preliminary meeting, on the 5th of July of the same year, in 1887, the College Association of Pennsylvania was organized at this place. You know in the following year the College Association of Pennsylvania became the Association of Colleges in the Middle States and Maryland, and that in 1892, at Swarthmore, the organization took a wider scope and was organized as the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, and under which title it has been working ever since.

Now it is with especial pleasure that we greet you here this morning, for two reasons: in the first place, this is the place of your birth; in the second place, because you have come to what I regard as a typical college—not a university, but a college; and this organization was in the first place an organization of colleges. It included, of course, the University of Pennsylvania; but the institutions represented here were pre-eminently colleges, and college questions came especially to be discussed in the earlier meetings of the Association.

You have come to Lancaster County and Lancaster City—Lancaster City, a good old town, at one time, as you know, the capital of the United States for a short time, when the Continental Congress had to leave Philadelphia because of certain unpleasant features in the environment at that time and it met in the old court house that stood in the center of our city; and you have come into a region of which we may well say, with Whittier, in "Barbara Frietchie," as he speaks of Fredericktown in Maryland—

"Fair as a garden of the Lord."

I wish, for some reasons, that you could have been here in midsummer, as you met here in the first place. You speak of "a warm welcome" sometimes; I don't believe the season would have made it any warmer; but you might have seen this city, this country, and this spot perhaps under better advantages than you see it at this time.

However, you are here now and you are here in the interests, I take it, of the same questions that prompted the organization of this association in the first place. Franklin and Marshall College is not a very old institution in one sense; and yet in some respects it is older than the most of the colleges of the State—most of the colleges of this region—for the reason that in the very beginning of Franklin and Marshall College it drank deep of those fountains of learning that flowed from Germany when our American institutions of learning were very innocent of German thought and German philosophy. It was the good fortune of Franklin and Marshall College (Marshall College in the first place; Franklin and Marshall afterward) to be in touch with the thought of the fatherland; and hence it has come that there has prevailed in this institution not only the spirit of research and thoroughness which are characteristic of German institutions of learning, but a feeling for those branches of learning upon which at that time not so much stress was laid in institutions of learning—philosophic thought, for instance. Now the English and the American colleges and universities are glad to sit at the feet of the German teachers of philosophy. We drank of that fountain long ago; and there has been perpetuated, I think, in this institution, a stream of thought that has not been without its most beneficent results in the education which we have been trying to inculcate. Franklin and Marshall College has always stood for high, liberal culture; and it is not ashamed to-day to be a college. It does not claim to be a university. It lays stress on college education as liberal culture fitted to make men, preparatory to their taking up the study of a profession. We believe in professional studies; of course we do. We believe in the best possible preparation for technical work, or any work in life, if you please; we have no quarrel with technical schools and universities, not in the least; but we believe that whilst technical study is distinctly narrowing—as I think practice shows, everywhere—college training in broadening; and we believe in that broadening influence in the first place as of the greatest importance to give tone and character to our educational work in general. Then, in addition to that, we make no apology for being a denominational college. We are not denominational in the sense of being narrow or partisan in matters of religion; we require no religious tests, either of

professors or students; we are as free and as liberal and as generous as any one can be in all these respects; and yet we are not ashamed of being a denominational college in the sense that the college was founded by a denomination and is kept up by a denomination with a distinct purpose in view.

We are, I think, in full accord with a very able article that I have just read in *The Nation* this morning by Professor Alden, of Leland Stanford University, in which he maintained that there is a legitimacy "in the deliberate setting of collegiate education in an atmosphere fitted to promote certain tendencies in faith and morals."

Now faith and morals are one thing; the branches of knowledge which we study are another thing; but what father or mother is there that would not like a son or daughter brought up in certain tendencies of faith and morals? The time comes, undoubtedly, in university education, when a man must be free to move as he is guided and directed in his studies; but we believe that in the formation of character there is room for—that there is need of—an environment, an atmosphere, that will help to mold character so as to make men of faith, men of uprightness, strong, well-grounded, broad cultured, men who go out into the world and take their place in the different professions to speak for the cause which they represent.

One evidence of the ideals which we have cherished you will find in the literary society halls at this place to which I should like to call your attention. Nowhere else in the territory represented by this Association, except at Princeton, will you find any thing similar or equal to the halls which the literary societies here themselves own, and in which they hold their weekly meetings as purely literary societies. That goes to show the kind of ideal of culture which we emphasize. But I must not trespass upon your time, Mr. President and members of the Association. I only say these things in order to show that you have come to a college that believes in the ideals of culture to which I have referred. But let me say also that as you have advanced, as you have become a large and influential body, we have not been living in the backwoods either, without making some progress. We believe in scientific culture; we believe in laboratory work; we believe in thorough training—and we have not stood still in these respects, either. We try to offer the best that can

be had and given in these lines; and I invite you, whilst you are here, to visit our science hall, our laboratories, and see the work which we are doing in that direction. We believe in educational progress; but we want to stand by the old landmarks.

And now, speaking on behalf of an institution of this kind, in the name of Franklin and Marshall College and of the affiliated institutions—the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, and Franklin and Marshall Academy—I welcome you most cordially to these surroundings. All the grounds are open to you; and we shall extend to you such hospitality as we can furnish. We are glad you are in our midst; we bid you welcome, thrice welcome, to these halls.

RESPONSE BY

PRESIDENT JAMES G. CROSWELL.

President Stahr: For the Association of which I have the honor to be speaker at this moment, we thank you for the warmth, the grace and the courtesy of your welcome. As you have given me a figure of speech, I accept your paternal kindness with much pleasure. We come back as the children—as the child—of Franklin and Marshall College, to spend Thanksgiving. Where should a child spend Thanksgiving except with the old folks? And as we are twenty-one, the age of explosive emotions, will you allow me to explode? Most heartily, most gratefully, in return for delightful invitation and reception this morning, I thank you in the name of the body I have the honor to preside over. If I may take one moment in addition I will say that the Association accepts with peculiar pleasure your paternal words, your paternal and kindly advice, and your family feeling for us. We come, in fact, from many places, but I think we have preserved the Franklin and Marshall tradition uncommonly well. We of the Association have—and have every day more and more—a feeling for each other; a fraternal feeling which I am sure we did not need President Stahr to tell us was eminently rife on this campus and in this town. Coming up here this morning, I was addressed three times as “Friend”

by strangers; and when I asked the policeman the way to Franklin and Marshall College, he said "Right up that street, Brother!" I have lived in New York thirty years and I have never been on those terms with a policeman before.

As to the other feeling of which you speak as traditionary here, we share that also; we do believe in colleges; also, in preparatory schools. We believe in church traditions, we believe in denominations, on the understanding that we don't all believe in one denomination: "E pluribus unum" is our motto. This Association is one made up of a very great variety. It is an imposing thought, when one stops to think of the variety and the quantity of the different traditions that we do represent. We represent the Twin Empire States of the Union; we represent all the States—the Middle States which bind and hold the Union together. We represent not only one capital of the country, but three, as you say—Philadelphia, Lancaster and Washington. We have every reason to believe in permanent, faithful adherence to local tradition; and when the day comes, if it ever comes, that the American people fancy that our local traditions as you speak of do not count, or that small States are not as important as the large ones and that the little colleges with their personal traditions so dear and so powerful are not worth saving—when American localities grow to be pins in one universal paper, indistinguishable from each other, then, I think, we shall have lost something precious in the United States.

We thank you, sir, very much for your welcome. We are going to play the part of the returning son, I hope, and tell our mother college all the things we have been doing and how much we have been doing; and it will be no harm to brag a little. Things have happened in the last twenty-one years and this Association has been mixed up most effectively in the work of education. Before taking my seat as president for the year, I shall have the pleasure of introducing Dr. Sachs, of New York, who will represent to us those who have done most of the effective work of the institution in the last twenty-one years.

A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY AND WORK OF THE
ASSOCIATION.

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Just one year ago, those who attended the evening meeting of this Association, in the hall of the College of the City of New York, saw the venerable figure of Dr. Magill enter the hall; if they were near enough they observed him follow with his old-time interest the admirable presidential address of that meeting; to many of us he embodied the vital link that bound this flourishing Association to its modest beginnings. Had his life been spared, and his health permitted, he, and no other, would have been the proper interpreter of the significance of this occasion. With the consciousness, therefore, of a grave responsibility, and with a sense of my own inadequacy, I undertake to survey the progress of the work which the father of this Association would much more effectively have pictured. No one who knew him would for a moment have feared that the congratulations which are in order at such times would have betrayed any taint of immodesty. The credit that attaches to the performance of praiseworthy service should appear in the results achieved, rather than in our words.

Your committee has seen fit to assign the review to one who was admitted to your ranks after you had plotted out on large lines your aims and plans. It is these aims, as they have taken shape, and as they seem likely to develop further possibilities, that I shall endeavor to indicate.

For a brief space let us indulge in the luxury of revery; once, at least, at the close of the 21st year of its existence, this Association may fairly turn from educational problems of larger or minor scope to a cursory glance at—ourselves, our beginnings as an organization, our growth, our failures, if we detect any, our successes, if we can point to any of sufficient significance.

If the survivors of the earliest meetings of the Pennsylvania College Association compare them with these latter-day gatherings that have more than once, according to outward circumstances of meeting-place and program-arrangement, tested the capacity of great college halls, they may perchance long for the

intimate converse of those early days, when a small membership of kindred souls were placidly engaged in common and congenial enterprise. And yet, they ought not entertain such regrets; for this Association, in its present vigorous shape, is distinctly foreshadowed in the early records to which your historian has had access. Conceived originally as the College Association of Pennsylvania, it had no sooner completed its first convention than some of its incorporators, among them President Magill, urged in executive session that a committee appointed to report on Uniformity of Requirements for Admission to College confer with a committee of the Schoolmasters' Association of Pennsylvania upon this subject; it was its first invitation to a body foreign to itself to join in conference, and it is significant that it was a body of school men whose suggestions were invited. In the same meeting, but following upon the first suggestion, came the proposal to invite to co-operation in their deliberations the colleges of the other Middle States and Maryland. There exists no evidence of an immediate or tangible outcome of the conference with the Pennsylvania Teachers' Association; even if any recommendations of value on the matter of "Uniform Entrance Requirements" emerged from mutual discussion, they were left unrecorded; the possibility of consummating the larger organization, of focusing within a far more influential body the discussion on all questions of common interest, absorbed all other interests, but the legacy of the parent association to the Association of Colleges of the Middle States was a broad and liberal interpretation of its original object. I find that "Consideration of Qualifications of Candidates for Admission, and of the Character of Preparatory Schools" was included in the objects mentioned in the original draft of its Constitution; and the new Association assumed the same function, prompted not by a desire to exercise an irksome supervision, but actuated, as distinctly avowed, by the wish to unite the educational interests within its territory.

"To give emphasis to this, its vital aim," so the records read, "the executive committee of the reorganized College Association recommended to circulate its minutes among the preparatory schools." Some of the most valuable utterances of those early meetings were not entered upon the books in full detail, but the spirit of the new educational movement which prompted the

papers "On the *duty* of the University to the Common Schools," and "The Relations and *Duties* of Colleges of the Preparatory Schools," is unmistakable. The message of fellowship, of friendly guidance, on the part of those entrenched in well-established authority is the precursor of the more complete, more sympathetic relation of the following years, and it is fraught with all the more significance, for there were many questions of deeper college and university interest that awaited consideration, questions that might have absorbed the attention of the assembled college representatives. How much that is of permanent value, how much that bears the stamp of truly pioneer effort lies hidden away in the annals of such an Association as this! An occasional utterance becomes, under the inspiration of animated discussion, rich in suggestion, prophetic in quality. It awakens in the student of such records a becoming sense of humility to realize how much of what appears best in our recent discussions has been fully considered before, and again it may serve as a caution to the gallant Hotspurs of these our gatherings, not to give themselves up "to thick-eyed musing and cursed melancholy," if they do not achieve at the first onset the practical success that they believe is their meed. New thoughts that involve departure from existing practice, can not at once win general recognition; however impressive they are at the time, their significance may temporarily be lost sight of; arguments, though convincing, must be reiterated, must be marshaled in somewhat different fashion; and a generation may pass before a reform is fully established. Of such character are the addresses of several of our leaders who have passed away, or have retired from active duty; in Dr. Magill's paper on "The Object of Modern Language Study" we find views advanced that will have to be emphasized still further, before the doctrine is realized in practice; and Provost Pepper's analysis of "The University in Modern Life" establishes that institution's important service to the general cause of education in terms that acquire increased potency because of the growth and spread of the university idea. To several papers of Francis March (1889 and 1892) may be attributed the impulse that ushered in the selection of a uniform program of English readings for study in the schools. The idea of working toward uniformity which he formally enunciated develops later through the Ithaca resolution (1891) that recommended

substantially identical requirements in English, into the activities of the Committee on English, and points the way to some of the most notable measures of concerted action on other lines. And when James Morgan Hart in 1891, at the close of a general discussion on Language Teaching, made his plea for the cultivation of a feeling of homogeneity between professor and school teacher in the words, "If professor and instructor are to be in accord on all points, they must recognize in each other representatives of the same educational forces," he outlined in substance the basis of the later union. The conditions under which this union was effected were unusual, unconventional enough to warrant a fuller statement of them here; and the Swarthmore meeting of 1892 many of us regard as epoch-making in the history of the mutual relations of schools and colleges.

The New York Schoolmasters' Association had, during the several years of its existence, been increasingly disturbed by the lack of uniformity in the entrance requirements to the colleges; it assumed that if it could secure a hearing before the members of the Middle States College Association, and convince them of the distracting influence of such diversity, its difficulties might to some degree be relieved, and it made application that a committee of its members be granted an opportunity to discuss the question. Of the probable attitude of the College Association toward such a request no member of the committee was assured, nor had they been aware that there was then under consideration a resolution of Professor Nicholas Murray Butler's from the previous meeting at Ithaca (1891), "to consider the advisability of so extending the scope and membership of the Association as to include representatives of the Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland." With such a proposal under consideration, the College Association expressed its readiness to receive the delegation; it invited the New York delegates to a conference with its executive committee, who, on the following day, recommended immediate action in favor of making the Association henceforth representative of colleges, universities, and approved high and preparatory schools within its boundaries. It is well to recall the *spirit* in which the action of the College Association was taken, and it may not be inappropriate to dwell briefly on the significance to the general cause of education of this outspoken attitude of cordiality toward the

secondary schools; an attitude of such moment that we may safely consider this action one of the most important educational manifestations of the last quarter century.

It was, of course, part of a great movement toward readjustment, whose signs were visible elsewhere as well. Affiliation in organization, correlation in effort, have become such self-evident needs that the terms are almost trite, and it is a little difficult to recall the complete absence of tendency toward associated endeavor between college and school before 1892. Why, even the elementary school had admittedly a more distinctive individuality; it functioned with a recognized authority within generally accepted bounds, while the secondary school, whose limits downward and upward were undefined, received little or no acknowledgment for performances of its own, a Cinderella of the educational household. Was it not the current sentiment in many parts of the country that the secondary school ever needed watching, closest supervision, that without such insistent control it was sure to become derelict? In no invidious spirit we may claim that the Middle States Association has led all similar organizations in its cordial recognition of the individuality, the inherent worth of the secondary school. From the first, there appears in the published utterances of the parent organization abundant evidence of an hospitable spirit to all sound educational thought, whatever the source. It is as though the Association had been girding itself for the larger issues of the last decade and a half; in the bulletins of its activities during those earliest years are traceable the germs of many an educational scheme that is but now approaching fruition.

This same year, 1892, stands out prominently in the history of higher education; another and as widely known co-operative effort of colleges and secondary schools left its impress on the educational interests of this country; I refer to the selection of the Committee of Ten, and its nine sub-committees, in which for the first time school and college men engaged in conferences to formulate constructive measures for the conduct and organization of school curricula. As we now survey the work of this committee, and the embodiment of its results in the Report that has achieved national repute, and recall the various educational measures which have been the immediate outcome of this union, we realize that a radical change has come into the

' relations of the several educational forces operative in our community, and the schools in particular have benefited greatly because of these relations. Vitality, significance, has been given to their work; it is worth living, when you are assigned an honorable part in an uplifting, inspiring movement that makes for distinct progress; there can never again be a dismemberment of interest, now that the college theorist and the school practitioner have co-operated to recommend safe lines of procedure, and to terminate the chaotic conditions that formerly prevailed in the schools. No one would of course assert that a completely satisfying arrangement was the immediate outcome, but the definition by the college men of their standards, whilst the school men disclosed the actual problems of the adolescent, led to a consideration of the larger question of the interests of the high school pupil; the sentence, embodied in the general report of the Committee of Ten, that "pupils were to be prepared for life, not merely for college," has been adopted as the corner stone of our educational faith, and we are now witnessing the process of adjustment to this doctrine in the requirements of some of our leading colleges. And yet it is in no partisan spirit that despite the more striking manifestations of that Report, we find that the *greater* outlook toward progress lies in such an organization as ours; in the quiet and continuous work, that is only possible when men in constant and intimate intercourse come to appreciate each other's powers and motives, there lies the guarantee of permanent betterment. The deliberate consideration that can only be obtained in prolonged conferences has more than once in our history helped to solve real educational difficulties.

And so we may rejoice that our Association has come to regard its mission as that of a committee in permanency, charged with the duty of promoting the interests common to school and college. Will it not be wise to curb our impatience, if things do not always and immediately move to that happy solution that we all desire? The very fact that our agitation for change, for reform, need no longer consider a small and segregated part of the educational world, but that, when it secures a hearing, it at once affects a large constituency, is a marvelous gain; we have once for all adopted a permanent bond of united action; progress is linked to the marshaling of large units; as in political strife, a

great and vigorous combination of forces must precede a liberalizing of those same forces. From this union there has issued abundant benefit to both contracting parties. To speak of the secondary school men first: the relations that have developed have assured to them many and varied benefits. The individual teacher need no longer indulge in idle complaints about the undue pressure that he experiences in his dealings with one or the other college; at the forum of our common council board it will appear whether his grievances represent actual hardships; frank discussion of difficulties leads to enlightenment, and the spirit of conciliation, of working in unison for a common cause, takes note of honest criticism, as it discourages captious fault-finding. The teachers have felt the necessity of self-criticism; they have found it advisable to scrutinize their own performances before they undertake to clamor for redress. And the colleges for their part have freely acknowledged that their former academic attitude was injudicious; it omitted to consider the real situation of the schools, whose difficulties the college officer of a decade ago did not appreciate; today these obstacles are better understood because of the frank interchange of opinions and experiences that has become a feature of our gatherings. A greater and a more inspiring outcome, it seems to me, than the satisfactory adjustment of questions of immediate utility, has been the insistence on common ideals that has marked all our important discussions. There has been effaced the conception that educational thought, educational progress makes its stronger appeal to the cloistered scholar than to the practical teacher; increasing acquaintance with each other's viewpoint has fostered increasing appreciation of each other's standards and motives. Our published proceedings are so much documentary evidence of the breadth of intellectual sympathy that has prevailed in our organization; and here again, the impromptu remarks from the floor that *follow* prepared addresses are the true index of the dominant spirit. In our published proceedings the future historian of educational movements will be able to trace the inception, the progress, the maturing of many important educational measures; he will, I hope, not fail to appreciate how much credit is due to the Society's Executive Committee; both the selection for our annual meetings of vital topics, and the skilful juxtaposition of representative exponents of these topics are matters

of no mean significance; and the constantly maintained interest of the most influential college officers speaks volumes for the delicate tact, the wise initiative of those in whose hands rested the policy of successive meetings. A survey of all the topics discussed since 1893 discloses the fact that the major portion deals with the relationship of school and college, the transition from the one to the other, the relative character of the same subjects taught in both; occasionally, as in last year's sessions, every topic on the program, including even the president's address, bore upon this inter-relation.

The unwritten law that this Association adopted for its guidance shortly after the amalgamation in 1892, and which established the alternation in the presidency of the Society between college and secondary school men, emphasized the identity of interests throughout the organization.

A study of the successive presidential addresses during the last fifteen years will reveal that they do not by any means always indicate the specific spheres of the several presidents; the topics handled pass constantly from general interest to general interest; they reflect a ready response, year after year, to any new and important issues in educational thought.

But *individual* presentations of opinion, whether by presiding officer or member from the floor, may be forcible or startling, and yet they may not create permanent effect; it is in the larger pieces of work undertaken by this Association that its enduring service lies.

And I would recall first that from the constituency of this Association have sprung several adjunct societies, who have developed a new activity of their own; such are the History Teachers' Association, vigorous and active at various local centers; such the Classical Teachers' Association, whose most important papers regularly appear in the Classical Weekly.

But never for a moment has the membership in these subsidiary societies withdrawn sympathy from the main organization, and the missionary work on which its committees have been engaged.

What has been the function of these committees? Briefly, it has been this: the translation of conviction into practice, and in the success of these various efforts lies the secret of the great influence that this Association has exerted. It is not necessary

to mention by name those to whose initiative these undertakings owe their existence; the swift response to their suggestions is proof positive that they gave voice and form to tendencies toward which their fellow-members had gradually matured in the free interchange of opinions that was current in the Association's discussions.

At the first regular meeting of the re-constituted Association, there was appointed a committee "to consider the present usage in the matter of entrance examinations in English language and literature in the colleges of this Association, and to recommend a scheme of uniform entrance requirements in English to these colleges."

The spirit that prompted the members of this committee to carry forward in collaboration with affiliated committees from other societies their labors against petty criticisms, obloquy and indifference; to suggest system where hitherto there had been no traditional usage, only wide discrepancy in theory; to improve upon their first efforts in a succession of revisions is one that compels admiration and profound esteem. Those who have not shared in the deliberations of such committees may not realize what a fund of valuable professional experience is crystallized in the ultimate reports that have gone forth; it is fair to say that there is a loss to the world of educators in the fact that many of the detailed discussions of these committees have remained unrecorded; the excellent papers which usually accompany the final presentation of committee reports represent only in part the quality of the deliberations themselves. In the particular case under consideration, the committee work on English, there is suggested for instance in the recent lists of recommended books to him who can read between the lines far more than a mere choice of reading matter; these lists stimulate to the exercise of preference; they permit adaptation to the tastes and environment of the pupil, and they mean to be, if the teachers would but interpret correctly, a protest against narrow and pedantic study of a subject that should above all else liberate, inspire, delight. The history of this committee has repeated itself in the various other committees whose labors have been ratified by the general Association. If we are to appreciate at their full value these efforts, we must remember that committee work of this kind acts as a safety-valve; it interposes a wholesome check

upon the random conclusions to which large public gatherings are prone; it substitutes caution, wise compromise for sudden impulses; it makes for deliberation, adjustment of interests; it reaches its conclusions on the basis of a comprehensive study of the situation. I doubt whether in any single case it has been found necessary to reverse the recommendations of one of our committees; incomplete for one or another reason the work may have been; inconsequential, never.

I have reserved for the last the consideration of that particular achievement which is unquestionably the most distinct contribution of this Association to higher education in the United States, the creation of the College Entrance Examination Board. We may not be ready for the final judgment on the merits of this Board; of its value in the present situation, as a means of assimilating the schools and colleges in a large part of the country, there can be no question; its phenomenal growth is an index of its immediate appropriateness and effectiveness. It has carried very far beyond the territory that limits our activities and our interests, the ideals as they formulated themselves in the minds of its founders; its influence has been felt even in institutions that do not acknowledge its methods nor apply its standards. If it represents, as I think it does, with a high degree of efficiency, the *organization* of educational effort, it owes this element of its unusual success to the boldness of inception, to the care and patient elaboration of detail that has originated within this Association. As before, it would be invidious to particularize; the College Board is the child of this Association; the encouragement bestowed by the united association on its earliest efforts was as necessary as the initiative that shaped its policies; a genuine alliance between conservatism and progress characterizes its actions; it has stood for compromise in the ideal conception of that term. "Earnestness of conviction," says Mr. Morley in his "Essay on Compromise," "is perfectly compatible with a sense of liability to error." It is in this spirit that the first organization was effected; college and school opinion within our own sphere had to be made hospitable to its proposals; in the theory and practice of administering its functions there was of necessity much that was novel, much that infringed upon habit and tradition. There were entertained in some quarters fears that a lowering of standards might issue from the continued

maintenance of these examinations; they have proved groundless; the tests of the Board have in fact given definite meaning to standards set; the elaboration of a *system* of measuring results which is responsibly administered has been necessary and has proved beneficial; the objections that have been raised apply to the inflexibility of rating results, a hardship that is inseparable from the conscientious administration of an elaborate examining scheme; but even in this direction the conference method adopted by the readers minimizes the grounds of criticism.

The supervision of the examination questions by the secondary teachers on the Board has proved the most valuable feature of the scheme. A well-considered plan, as this one undoubtedly was, does not reveal at once all its possibilities; within its future scope it may embrace administrative and educational questions not contemplated in its original conception. Even as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has found, as it elaborated its pensioning scheme, in this very scheme a means of standardizing the colleges that desire to become participants of its benefactions, so the Examining Board, with an experience larger than has ever before been available, must sooner or later undertake the duty of securing better definitions of requirements, where present statements have been shown unsatisfactory. "If once infected," as a recent critic of the American college puts it, "with a more experimental and genuine pedagogical spirit, it may become the means of radical, even if gradual, reform."

Our Examination Board, on that point I think we are all in accord, does not represent the final step on the road to highest educational efficiency; in its compact organization, its growing influence on college-entrance control of a certain type, we recognize the conditions that must always precede freedom and flexibility. Great changes, greater than any of the last decade, are, however, imminent. In this month's "Atlantic," President Pritchett has demonstrated, I am fain to believe, that the adjustment of the college in a general system of education is the problem of the next twenty years; it is no longer, even at this moment, the crown of the educational edifice; and as it settles, to quote President Pritchett, into its proper place, of a transition school in which the student grows out of discipline to freedom, out of the tutelage of boyhood into the liberty of men, its relation to

the schools antecedent to it will perforce be changed. In the face of this impending general reorganization one may safely say, we have not reached the end of our usefulness; greater achievements are on the horizon.

We have been perfecting, as far as the outer mechanism can do so, the means of controlling the work of the secondary school that is to satisfy the college demand. But there is a higher goal even than the strength that issues from complete organization. The effectiveness of the examination scheme is to be regarded as a prelude merely to the legitimate self-control and responsibility of the secondary school.

The day does not now seem so faintly remote when the secondary school shall have become so strong, so efficient that *its* verdict will determine fitness for college. Just one hundred years ago the German educational authorities realized the futility of admitting students to university work by entrance examinations; Paulsen, in his "*Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts*," draws a vivid picture of universities, weakly accepting unworthy and unqualified candidates to swell their numbers. The gymnasium that reared the pupil was to pass upon his qualifications in its final examination. A responsible school, a responsible body of teachers proud of their record, could be trusted to safeguard quality, to maintain high standards. True, Prussia at that time initiated a central authority that controlled appointments and determined courses of study. Have we no stimuli to insure high standards, broad educational aims, rational curricula? We may find a way of inspecting schools, of measuring teachers' attainments that will guarantee to the college the student-body it needs; let the college be as specific as possible in formulating the intellectual standards it demands of its entering students, the capacity, the power of initiative that it can develop further; I believe the schools will welcome the most exacting scrutiny of their teachers, their methods, their equipment; let such scrutiny be searching, not superficial and casual; let it be constant, but let it also be suggestive, helpful; the more the college officers investigate, the closer they will get to the schools, the more they will realize the school problems, the more they will appreciate the value of good teachers. No college certificate board, passing by clerical records on the merits of schools; but a systematic investigation, carried on rationally, consistently, by a number of representa-

tive professors from representative colleges, whose verdict finds ready acceptance. We have never attained to the highest reaches by conditions imposed from without; we thrive when we voluntarily accept, invite, critical judgment of our performances; when the schools are not under the stress of an occasional acute committee of inquiry, but when their plan of work, their practice, is as open as the day to any expert observation, then we shall have the field legitimately cleared for secondary education; the preparatory school will have lost its function; it must and will become a school for the training of the adolescent pupil; there will be various types, and there will be ample room for all of them; then there will be a possibility of working out a logical system of secondary education; there will be education, not cramming and coaching, and the colleges will find their reward in a better type of student.

And this Association, I am confident, will gladly co-operate toward these results.

If another anniversary like this one shall have brought us nearer to such a goal, we of the older generation, if we survive, may look back with pride upon the stepping stones by which we passed from the imperfect standards of an earlier day to the maturing of a sounder educational doctrine.

THE PRESIDENT. I have a friend, ladies and gentlemen—a school teacher—in whom the ego is pretty strongly developed, who refused to come to the meeting of this Association on the ground that teachers' conventions in holiday time were an invention of the enemy to prevent us from either resting or working. I think there is something in that. I think that is true of all teachers' conventions except ours. We do both here. I am sure it is a rest to the spirit to listen to such a paper as Dr. Sachs', illustrating the gentle patience, the calm persistence, and the abounding hopefulness of our twenty-one years and the victories that have come to us. I am sure it is a rest to the mind to listen to any school teacher who can write English like that. I do not wish to imply that there are not others, or that the standard of the Association is not at all times and places adequate; but I think we all feel—I dare say it in public here—that there is one of our number whose work, enshrined in that Valhalla, the annual report of the proceedings of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, is at

once grateful to the ear when heard, and delightful to read when printed. But now we must go to work. A recent book by a Harvard professor states, over many pages, the problem of education in the Latin language and literature—in a very pessimistic strain. It is said that one never learns Latin at all—that Latin in school is only a useful method of cultivating the “voluntary attention”; the more Latin you take, the stronger grows your voluntary attention. It gives me a great pleasure to introduce to you a more hopeful person, one who is himself a Latin teacher and scholar and who does believe that it is possible to learn the Latin language—Professor Gonzalez Lodge, of the Teachers’ College.

CAN STUDENTS BE TAUGHT TO READ LATIN?

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ LODGE, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Your invitation to read a paper upon the general subject of the reading of the classics I accepted with pleasure as an indication of the widespread interest in the position occupied by Latin and Greek in our educational system, and with the hope that this influential Association might feel disposed to take some effective measures for the support and relief of us classical teachers who are still hampered by the traditions of a century of steadily declining interest.

I must preface my discussion by a brief statement of the objects we are seeking to attain in studying the classics in our schools, and I shall restrict my remarks to the Latin language, because Latin still holds an influential position in the curriculum. I shall not touch upon controversial matters any more than is necessary.

We study Latin in the schools, therefore, mainly with three ends in view: (1) Formal discipline. Thirty years ago teachers of the classics and other influential thinkers steadily maintained that the study of Latin was one of the best, if not the best, instrument for general intellectual development. With the growth in the science of psychology exception was taken to these sweeping claims, and for a while psychologists went to the extreme of denying that training in any particular branch of study strengthened the mind for the study of another and different branch. Their utterances were directed especially against classics, which, they affirmed, had no value so far as mental discipline was concerned, in preparing the mind for work in different fields. This extreme position of the psychologists has been greatly modified, and it is now recognized that while the claims made by the old adherents of classical training were entirely too broad, yet still study in any line is apt to have some good effect on the training of the mental faculties in general.

Professor Angell, of the University of Chicago, in the *Educational Review* for June, summarizes a discussion of this topic as follows:

(1) Certain habits gained in the mastery of one study may be appropriated directly in another; they may (2) be slightly

modified before such application and still show for their possessor a great gain as compared with the individual who has to start from the beginning. (3) These habits may be incorporated in larger habit groups, either with or without slight modification. (4) They may tend to impede certain antagonistic habits and in turn be impeded by other previously extant and inhibitory habits. (5) But in all these cases, the instances of inhibition as well as those of reinforcement and incorporation, it seems probable that a certain gain in the power to use and sustain attention will accrue from any purposeful and persistent intellectual application. . . . This principle probably holds true in memory, in reasoning, in observation, and in all the forms of mental activity which common thought and language distinguish. (6) What subjects best reinforce one another; what ones most inevitably conflict with one another; whether these relations depend upon the mode of presentation, rather than upon the subject-matter itself; these and other similar questions, too numerous to point out, must one and all be answered by experiment and experience. Dogmatism is wholly impossible in advance of such drastic and exhaustive investigation.

If this becomes, as seems likely, the attitude of psychologists in general, we classical teachers may legitimately hold that training in Latin exercises more faculties in more various ways than any other single subject in our educational curriculum.

(2) Latin is valuable for the opportunity it gives for training in general linguistics, and, by consequence, in the more accurate knowledge of our mother tongue. This claim has been made with a good deal of vigor in recent years and has not been controverted to any extent, although I am convinced that it has not been accepted as it should be by a large number of people. Here, too, the claims put forth have been greater than the facts justify. Training in Latin will not make a writer who has little or no linguistic sense an accurate user of English, and it is unquestionably true that a large number of our most successful writers of the present day have had little or no classical training. It is a fact that the best preparation for the idiomatic handling of English is association with people who use it with accuracy and taste. Children learn to use English very largely under the instruction of those who have no conscious knowledge of the formative elements in English speech, and therefore to the un-

thinking man the claim that a knowledge of Latin and Greek is necessary to use English accurately and with taste seems absurd. It is, however, not so absurd as it looks to be. While the ability to write English with fluency and taste may be acquired without any classical training on the part of the writer, we must remember that classical training has been an influence just the same, if not directly at least indirectly through long tradition, either on the part of the parents or teachers. For the standards of literary taste must be the standards of those books which have lived and will live as the monuments of our literary genius, and it is a matter of common knowledge that the imperishable part of our literature, and that which forms the standard according to which our present style is modelled, has been so profoundly influenced by the classical literatures that it is difficult to separate the English element from the classical. But apart from authors there will always be a large number of people with greater or less literary taste whose enjoyment of literature will be much enhanced by that apprehension of its niceties which can come only from a knowledge of the means employed, just as in the case of music appreciation is greatly furthered by even an elementary knowledge of the principles of musical technique, and it should be one of the aims of our education to increase the number of such.

(3) We study Latin in order to get a first-hand acquaintance with a certain amount of Latin literature. This reason is the weakest of the three that I am bringing forward. It is the weakest because the amount of literature thus studied is so exceedingly small. Many unthinking people maintain that the study of Latin is not necessary for this, and think that the influence of the Latin literature and its value can be apprehended by reading translations just as well as by reading the original. Unthinking people I say, because the overwhelming testimony is in favor of the statement that almost all that makes the pleasure of Latin literature is lost in translation. The nearer the translation approximates the idiom of the language used, the better it is—as a translation—according to the common consensus of opinion. And this is true; but a work like Jowett's translation of Plato, which is given as an example, is so nearly an English book that the readers of Jowett will unquestionably lose—not the contents of the original Greek, but the flavor, the setting, and in very large measure the effect. Now, even the small amount of Latin

literature actually read in the original serves to give the student some understanding of the Latin literary ideal, and even more than that, of the genius of the Roman people, such as the reading of the whole literature in translation would be powerless to give.

Now, if we accept these three reasons for the study of Latin in the schools as valid, the question at once arises, "Do we succeed in meeting these aims to the fullest extent by our present system of teaching Latin?"

Let us take the third first. Do our students really gain an insight into Latin literature even in the small measure expected in our schools? The answer is decidedly negative. This is due chiefly to our failure to get our students to read the Latin at all with intelligence. The reason for this seems to be that the standard of measurement of success is entirely inadequate. We judge of this success not by finding out whether the pupil can read Latin, but by finding out whether he knows the general content of a certain number of pages of certain Latin authors and whether he can put upon paper more or less careful translations of these selections.

So far as the second point is concerned, the conscious, accurate knowledge of English, the answer must also be in the negative because of the same reason, except that in this case no systematic effort at all is made to test the influence of the Latin study upon the better comprehension of the English language.

Finally, in the case of our first reason, namely, that of formal discipline, it would appear that the answer would be affirmative; but this, too, can not be strictly true in view of the results. In the very first year of Latin a great deal of analytical study is demanded of the pupil, but this demand becomes steadily less in the years to come and the control of the student's work by the teacher becomes necessarily less definite. The formal drill is, it is true, kept up in Latin composition, but only against great discouragements, and composition is confessedly the most unsatisfactory in its results.

If this indictment of the results of our present teaching is just, and I think it is, it seems to me emphatically the business of the Association with the power that it possesses to take measures to avoid the waste of time which, in view of the results attained, must be admitted in our Latin teaching. This waste of time might seem to be lessened in two ways—(1) by lessening the

amount required; (2) by changing the method of instruction. If we lessen the amount required, we shall unquestionably check waste, but this checking will ultimately take the form of lessening the time bestowed upon the subject, for if what I say is true, the waste is not restricted to any particular year, but runs through the course. Thus cutting the amount will probably not limit the waste on the time remaining.

It seems evident, therefore, that our remedy really lies in a change in the method of instruction. This is inextricably connected with the attitude of our colleges towards the entering student. The requirements for entrance to college, so far as they are formulated for examination, are, in the case of most colleges, briefly these:

(1) A knowledge of Latin forms and syntax, tested usually by an examination in prose composition, which is always, or almost always, unsatisfactory.

(2) The ability to translate with fair success some passage previously read in school.

(3) The ability to answer certain syntactical questions based on the passage translated.

It is not uncommon in addition to demand the translation of a sight passage, but very little stress is, as a rule, laid on this.

Now, I wish to emphasize what has been pointed out more than once, that with the exception of the examination in prose composition this test does not really measure the student's knowledge of Latin or show whether he is fit to pursue the subject after he enters college. The examination in prose composition is, as I have said, most unsatisfactory, and the majority of the failures are in this subject. The examination in sight translation, so far as it is given, is unsatisfactory mainly because the examiner hardly knows what to expect. After all, most examiners feel that they should not expect from the candidates what the candidate has had no means of learning, and as they are in most cases ignorant of what the range of secondary teaching involves, they are willing regularly to give the candidate the benefit of the doubt. No college instructor at the present time admits that the results of the entrance examinations are satisfactory in determining whether the student is capable of pursuing the subject or not, and all college instructors agree in wishing that a candidate for entrance should display a greater knowledge of Latin. The ex-

amination in the translation of a passage previously read is in general merely a memory test and not a test of acquaintance with the subject. The examiner would seem to be in much the same position that an examiner in any subject would occupy where the learning of a number of facts rather than the display of ability to handle these facts is the aim. It is the claim of mathematics that it teaches its students to work out problems themselves. It is the claim of Latin that to translate a passage of Latin into English requires the exercise of many of the highest intellectual faculties; in the case of mathematics the claim is founded upon achievement; in the case of Latin the claim is an iridescent dream. So far as achievement goes, every college teacher would gladly admit that a student who can translate a sight passage with correctness shows an acquaintance with the language that meets all his demands. But the natural corollary, that the training in the school should be directed towards producing just this sort of knowledge of the language does not seem to be as widely understood as it should be. This brings me, after it would seem a long introduction, to the purpose of the paper.

Every sentence is composed of words and expresses a thought. It is written down for the purpose of making that thought easy of transmission to countless readers; but they must have learned the language before this is possible. The learning of a language consists in the learning of the symbols which are used to embody the thought. These symbols are called words and phrases. Incidentally, and sometimes from necessity, the laws of combination of these words and phrases have also to be learned. In the case of a language like Latin a knowledge of these laws is essential. Common sense, it would seem, therefore, would demand that the work of a student in Latin should be directed towards learning these written symbols and the laws which govern their combination. Probably because this is the demand of common sense it is regarded by a good many people as absurd. "Learning vocabulary," they say, "is what you mean," and they heap a great deal of derision upon vocabulary, absolutely oblivious of the fact that without the vocabulary there can be no understanding of the text.

The most of our school editions of Cæsar, Cicero, and Vergil are so annotated that the pupil is not expected to learn vocabulary. I do not refer to the small lexica at the back of the books; even in addition to these all passages that require any thinking are

translated in the notes. It seems to be the aim of our various editions to relieve the pupil of the necessity of thinking at all, and the fact that this is not wholly accomplished is not due to any lack of effort on the part of the editor. The chief aim of a teacher of a book thus annotated must be to impress upon the pupil's memory the translation of a certain particular passage; but this quite reverses the sequence of the processes. The aim of the teacher should be to provide the pupil with a sufficient knowledge of the language to enable him to understand his Latin author merely as a matter of course. In other words the teacher should aspire to teach the student Latin and not to make a pupil learn a translation of Cæsar, to teach a student Latin and not merely a translation of Cicero, and the object of the examination should be to test the student's knowledge of Latin and not to see whether he has committed to memory a bad English equivalent of certain parts of his Latin author.

The teaching of the last century is responsible for the present condition of affairs. Cæsar, Cicero, and Vergil were from time immemorial used to teach Latin, but the accounts we get from old teachers of their object show that these books were used as a means to an end, the end being the learning of Latin. In the English schools the reading of the various authors went hand in hand with an immense amount of writing, and the ability to express oneself in Latin and, as the student went on, the writing of Latin verse with fluency was required of all. The transfer of this system to this country is responsible for many things. Our people, feeling no need for the ability to write Latin, either verse or prose, gradually and naturally restricted the teaching of those subjects. Latin verse has gone out, Latin prose is on its way, but the reading of the Latin authors still remains, and these seem likely to disappear, too, unless tangible results take the place of those we are familiar with.

Recently there has been a great searching of hearts among Latin teachers all over the world, and suggestions have been made from many quarters that the way to secure for Latin the consideration it deserves is to change the method of teaching entirely. If Latin is not to be necessarily for speaking in modern times, still there is a wide field open for it in reading alone. It is coming to be more and more generally understood that the quickest and most effective way to train a person to read a language fluently

is to train him by the so-called direct method. In reform gymnasien in Germany, in occasional schools headed by live instructors in England, in obscure quarters all over this country, individual teachers are teaching by the direct method. Pupils are being taught from the very beginning to understand the meaning of a Latin word when it is spoken. Teachers with no equipment themselves are striving against odds to introduce Latin into the classroom, partly under the stimulus of the colloquial exercises inserted in many of our beginner's books, partly in the hope, which is always justified, that the interest of their pupils will be aroused and maintained. Practically all of the reading of Latin in our schools for a century has been from printed text, and the acquaintance with Latin words has been merely an eye acquaintance. As a result the vast majority of our college students can not distinguish between the individual words in a Latin sentence that they hear read. The possibility of making a point in a speech with a Latin quotation such as has been so much desiderated here by comparison with earlier English practice is rendered nil, for the auditors can not understand the words uttered. If it were written on the blackboard it would often be readily intelligible.

The first step, therefore, in the reading of Latin with intelligence is to have an apprehension of the meaning and effect of a Latin word when heard. This means training in oral use of the tongue from the very beginning. It does not mean what is usually understood by Latin conversation. It does mean the variety of conversation such as is shown in question and answer where both question and answer are indicated in the passage under discussion. Such colloquial teaching has, however, another advantage in addition to making it easy for pupils to distinguish words when heard. It fixes the value of terminations and shows the effect of construction as no other kind of drill will. A pupil who has been trained to express his simplest ideas in Latin will not make the mistakes in forms which are made over and over again in college classes by students who have been studying the subject for five years. No measure has been devised for fixing the value of terminations as good as practical use of the forms in colloquial utterance.

I said designedly that this does not mean Latin conversation, but whether it does or not is largely a matter for the individual teacher to decide. Conversation in Latin is not particularly diffi-

cult. The Romans were in many respects like ourselves, or, as a clever English teacher has phrased it,

"Had not a Roman eyes? Had he not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food (except coffee and a few other trifles), hurt with the same weapons (except certain hideous machines), subject to the same diseases (except appendicitis and influenza), warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as an Englishman is? If one pricked him did he not bleed? If one tickled him did he not laugh?"

There are, therefore, multitudes of fields in which the ancient and the modern are on the same ground—in which the modern could express himself with exactness and ease in the language of the ancient. Many people will think that such ability is worth cultivating in itself. But the majority of students, even if they could, are not going to have much opportunity to converse in Latin, and therefore conversational control of it, while desirable, is not essential. On the other hand, colloquial teaching leads directly to fluent reading, and it is here that our system of teaching calls most loudly for reform.

Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, of the Perse School, Cambridge, England, in a paper in the *Rivista di Scienza*, gives some examples of the direct method, from which I choose one:

. . . suppose the reading lesson to include the three lines of Martial:

Nullos esse deos, inane caelum
Adfirmat Segius; probatque, quod se
Factum, dum negat haec, videt beatum.

The master reads out the lines, which *ex hypothesi* have not been prepared by the class, and as a first step to explanation asks:

Magister.—Quid primum adfirmat Segius?

Puer s. Pueri.—Nullos esse deos adfirmat Segius.

M.—Quid deinde adfirmat?

P.—Inane esse caelum adfirmat.

M.—Conjunge haec mutato ordine.

P.—Segius adfirmat nullos deos esse, et inane esse caelum.

M.—Intellegitisne omnes?

P.—Nescio quid sit inane.

M.—Inane idem est quod vacuum, quod nihil in se habet, hic scilicet quod deos habet in se nullos.

P.—Iam intellego.

M.—Pergamus ad alteram sententiam: quid probat Segius?

P.—Nescimus quid probet Segius.

M.—Nempe probat hoc verum esse, nullos esse deos probat esse verum, probat inane deis esse caelum.

P.—Intelligimus.

M.—Quid intellegitis?

P.—Probare Segius nullos esse deos et cetera.

M.—Ita, quare igitur, qua ratione?

P.—Quod se beatum esse videt.

M.—Quando se beatum esse videt?

P.—Dum haec negat, videt se esse beatum.

M.—Quamvis igitur haec negat, quamquam haec negat, nihilo minus se esse beatum videt. Scribite iam pedestri oratione id quod significat poeta; post haec vertite Anglice.

If it is admitted that the Latin reading that is done in schools should be an end in itself and not a means for obtaining control of the Latin language, then it follows that such reading should be done in such a way as to produce the greatest advantage; this means wholly under the eyes of a teacher. In the majority of cases, as at present taught, a child prepares his next day's translation at home. If he is conscientious he works out the lessons by means of commentary and vocabulary and arrives at a translation. Often he spends a great deal of time on a few words whose meaning is not clear, often a hint would have saved him much time and left him free to devote that time to further reading. If he is not conscientious he uses a translation and thereby loses almost all the value of the exercise. It is evident, therefore, that the translation at home of a passage from Latin into English involves, in most cases, a great waste of time.

How, then, should translation be conducted? Assuming that the pupil during his first year has been trained more or less in the direct method, assuming that he has always had to learn the meaning of the words which he was to use, and assuming—which is most important—that he has been made to use the words learned over and over again in daily drill, so that they have become a part of his unconscious apparatus, he is brought face to face with his first extensive reading. The teacher should know just what is new in the passage to be read the next day, and a certain part of the time of the class should be employed in going over this

passage, explaining the new words, and in every way putting the students into control of the instruments by which the ideas in the next day's lesson are expressed. His work at home should be the careful study of the new vocabulary, not necessarily by the memory only, but by writing a short composition involving these words in their idiomatic use. This composition may be written on a topic suggested by the instructor, or it may be the actual translation of certain set sentences. The object of it should be to fix the meaning of the new words in the student's mind. On coming to class the next day this exercise should be discussed, first with the use of colloquial Latin on the part of the teacher. Then the passage to be translated should be taken up, read in the Latin and translated at sight, such questions asked as would show that the class understood its meaning, and the rest of the hour should be taken up with a preliminary study of the succeeding day's lesson. This involves the keeping of a pretty accurate record on the part of both the teacher and the pupil of the new words learned, and the continual use of them by the teacher and pupil in writing and in oral practice. Such work is slow at the outset, and for a considerable time the progress seems to be that of a snail, but the strengthening of the pupil's knowledge is steadily increasing, and the time will come and come very soon when the ability to read will be shown by taking much longer lessons with ease. The reason for this lies in the much narrower range of the Latin vocabulary and the greater value of the individual Latin word. Taking four books of Cæsar, six orations of Cicero, and six books of Vergil's Aeneid, we found by actual count that in the Cæsar occurred 2,106 words, in the Cicero 2,117, and in Vergil 3,214. In altogether, 4,650, of this 1,954 occur five times or over, and, counting all occurrences, we note that out of 77,000 the words occurring under five times show only 4,956 occurrences. It is evident, therefore, that with 2,000 words the student can go very far in Latin reading.

Now, such a method involves several things; first, that the colleges should require for entrance the ability to read Latin of a certain range and with a certain vocabulary; second, the giving up of any requirement as to definite reading in the high school, so far as the learning of Latin itself is concerned. A certain requirement in reading, so far as contents of the matter read goes, might with justice be made. Then it also involves giving a high

school teacher the chance to select his own course of reading for his class, making him responsible for results at the end and stating definitely what those requirements are to be, but treating him as an intelligent being and confidently allowing him to arrange his course so that the results demanded will be gained. Give him freedom but hold him rigidly to account for the proper use of that freedom.

As I say, this scheme has been tried in Europe with success. It has been tried in various places in this country with results highly satisfactory to the teacher. There is only one great objection in the way of it, and that is the college teacher. The college teacher says that he wants the pupil to know Latin forms and Latin grammar before he comes to college, but in reality he wants to cover the narrowness of his own training by continuing in college to quiz his students on commonplaces of Latin syntax. He says he wants entering students to be able to read Latin, but if they had this ability the regular instruction of our freshman classes would have to be revolutionized. So, in reality, it seems to me that the college teacher does not want a class of students who can read Latin, or he would see at once that the way to get that class of students is to demand the ability to read Latin from students entering college, and to insist upon secondary teachers meeting that demand. If this were done we should be removing a difficulty, because the cry for relief on the part of secondary teachers in many parts of the country is taking the form of a demand for the lessening of the requirements in actual pages set and giving them freedom to choose their own course. We can trust the secondary teacher to do the very best that he can if we set before him an object worth working for, but, as matters now stand, no secondary teacher who loves Latin feels at all proud of sending up pupils who are prepared not to read the language which he loves, but to reproduce on paper a certain translation which has been drilled into them by hours upon hours of painstaking and unenlivened labor. Many a secondary teacher has a very small acquaintance with Latin literature because he never has opportunity to teach it; give him, therefore, a chance to read the Latin literature himself and he will inspire his students with a similar desire. Let him show that he can prepare them for real intelligent study of Latin authors and he will be glad to embrace the chance. Do not lay claim in the colleges to a

monopoly of the teaching of Latin literature (in my judgment more Latin literature is being taught in the high schools now than is taught in the colleges), but take the secondary teacher into your confidence and let him assist you in opening the wealth of classical learning to those students who are equal for it. And all this can be done by a modification of our entrance requirements and asking of the schools a single requirement—to be able to read Latin.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

PRESIDENT THOMAS FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, ANNAPOLIS, MD.—I have been waiting for some one else to open the discussion, but, as there appears to be a disinclination to do so, I have risen to make a few remarks upon the subject under discussion.

While listening to the paper that has been read, I was impressed with the thought that the writer demands a very great amount of care and attention for the preliminary preparation in Latin.

Now, looking back on my early life, I may say that I was educated in England, and that in the old country in those days the knowledge of Latin was considered of primary importance. I began to study it when eight years old, and by the time I was twelve I had finished reading Cicero and Virgil. I can remember that when I was about fourteen or fifteen it was a matter of pastime for me on a Sunday afternoon, if I had nothing else to do, to translate the psalms of the English Prayer Book into Latin Elegiacs. Latin was a part and parcel of our being—we lived and moved in an atmosphere of Greek and Latin, and consequently we arrived at the time when, as the writer of the paper just read refers to, we could talk and respond to our teacher in Latin, in a very pleasing manner.

On the other hand, when I look at the present generation, I see a very marked difference in the method of training. I have a son about fourteen years of age, and he has gone through the regular system of education provided in the American schools. He began to study Latin when about twelve years of age, and at the end of two years' instruction his knowledge of it is limited to an introduction to Cæsar.

Now, when I think of what I knew of Latin at the same age and compare it with what he knows, it seems to me that the whole question turns upon an inquiry as to the relative value of various branches of knowledge. Do we, in America, regard a knowledge of Latin of the same relative value as it was regarded twenty or thirty years ago in Europe? Is it not a fact that there are very many subjects now brought into an academic curriculum which demand the attention of the boys to the detriment of Latin, and which had no place formerly in a system of instruction? Consequently that we can hardly hope ever to get the rising generation to manifest that interest in Latin which would seem to be indicated by the writer of this paper.

I can imagine, in the case of my own son, that he will enter college and have the usual amount of knowledge of Latin to enable him to do so. During his college course he will read the required number of classical authors, but he will never take a living interest in the subject of Latin, so as to be able to follow and understand a Latin oration if delivered in his hearing.

He will, however, have been taught the fundamental elements and construction of the language, and have received an insight into the beauties of the literature. By this means he has achieved a valuable knowledge of the grammar upon which his own language is founded, and also acquired a beneficial mental discipline.

While I offer my congratulations for the extremely scholarly paper submitted to us by Professor Lodge and appreciate the high ideal that he has presented of what might be done, I think that the latter is in a measure somewhat beyond the ability of the ordinary youth prepared to enter college, and who subsequently passes through our hands as an undergraduate student.

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I trust that I understood Professor Lodge's position in the matter; I hope he will refute me if I have mistaken it. We know perfectly well that in this country such results as Professor Fell has intimated as the outcome of the formal English training are quite impossible; but in view of the fact that our Latin instruction of the present day leads to such an unsatisfactory result that it seems a waste of the young men's time under existing circumstances, we must look about and see whether the difficulty is not one of method of presentation, and I for one believe that Professor

Lodge's position is absolutely correct. It is the bad method of teaching the Latin that is making it appear so extremely wasteful. We need a revolutionizing of the teaching.

The teachers of Latin ought to manifest in the treatment of their subject that they are living in modern conditions; they ought not perpetuate simply what has been traditional in this country. There has been a loss of direct purposefulness in the work, and it is something of that kind that Professor Lodge proposes to remedy. The point that stands out in his statement, and which, I think, is central, is that a complete change from the system of home preparation (which has been pronounced the strongest point in the American educational scheme—which I think is one of the worst) is necessary.

Our teachers do not co-operate with the pupil in the class work. The best part of the work is to be done in the class; it is not to be a recitation but a lesson—a co-operative performance, which does not mean that the teacher give all the work and that the pupil is simply the recipient, but that he constantly draws upon the pupil from his previous knowledge of the subject and, combining the efforts of the stronger and the weaker pupils, develops the knowledge of the subject-matter. Send the pupil, after such a performance in which all have co-operated, to his home, with no other requirement than that he should recapitulate what he has obtained in the class. The method of the teacher's sitting inert and listening to what the students have evolved from the dictionary is not teaching. It is a change of method that is called for. We are asking for the Latin what is required in other branches. We are not going to assume that it is only the Latin teaching that is poor. The teachers of mathematics have found out within these last years that they are obliged to change their methods; and those who are familiar with the working of the mathematical associations, in the Middle West particularly, know that there a great change has come over mathematical teaching. I have no doubt that other subjects, like modern languages, call for the same change. It is simply in line with these that a thorough change in the method of procedure in the Latin is called for—a radical one. If it will lead to a correct definition, amongst other things, of this whole question of sight reading (which is the bane of a good many teachers), that will be hopeful.

I wish that Professor Lodge had raised the question what

college professors really mean when they ask for sight reading. I know one college officer who thinks that sight reading means taking up a Latin book and reading it off as though it were English. Those of us who know the difficulties involved realize that is absurd. It only accentuates the uncertainty of the position. What sight reading is, and how students are to be prepared for sight reading, is a very important question which will come up under this remodeling of the Latin course.

SUPERINTENDENT RANDALL SPAULDING, MONTCLAIR, N. J.—I am much interested in what Professor Lodge has said, the substance of which Dr. Sachs has apparently approved and reinforced.

There seems to me to be a great waste of time going on at present, and that in one of the most popular subjects in our country. Its popularity is indicated in the statistics of the National Bureau. Thousands of parents require their children to elect Latin because they consider a knowledge of Latin to be evidence of literary culture. The subject is therefore one of great importance and we do well to reconsider our methods of teaching.

This discussion seems to me, however, a recurrence of an old discussion of more than twenty years ago. I hope that Professor Lodge will explain to us just how and to what extent the plan that he advocates differs from the old much approved and much disapproved, much lauded and much despised "*methode naturelle*." This plan may not be quite so thoroughgoing or so radical as the older one; it may differ in certain details of application, but is it essentially different? Is there not in each the same appeal to the ear as well as to the eye?

For my own part I am glad that this question of method has been reopened. I remember having once as a teacher a young man who taught Latin by the so-called *Sauveur* method, which in certain features strikingly resembles the plan outlined by the speaker of the day. In my judgment his work was successful, and when he finally entered on the practice of law our profession lost a valuable teacher.

My experience, therefore, has convinced me that there are among us many teachers who, with a proper enthusiasm, can use efficiently the plan under discussion, although, of course, the meager qualifications of very many teachers present a difficulty that only time and toil can overcome.

I am not going to elaborate, but I wish Dr. Sachs would answer this question—How does this method differ from the method that we discussed many years ago on the road from Princeton to New York?

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I do not pretend to speak for Professor Lodge, but, as far as I am concerned, the method that I had in view, and which I have seen carried out in Germany, does differ very radically from the Sauveur method. The Sauveur method was distinctly mechanical—that is, it played upon a very narrow vocabulary, constantly twisting and turning the words in order to secure what was largely a recognition of the form without understanding the form. This method of which we are speaking plays with a great deal more freedom upon a much larger vocabulary. I disapprove of the value of the Sauveur method thoroughly. I remember that Professor Bocher, the famous French professor at Harvard, was a great believer in the Sauveur method applied to Latin, and he asked me to witness the efficacy of his work on his own son and daughter, who were at that time being taught by the Sauveur method. They had begun Latin with Cæsar—had studied five chapters of Cæsar. He said: "You can ask them anything you please. Put a question in Latin on those chapters of Cæsar and they will answer it." I did ask a few questions, but when I happened to put a question which involved one change of form from that they had gathered in the text, that is to say, when my question accidentally required a genitive instead of dative, all the wisdom was gone. There was a mechanical feature about the Sauveur method that doomed it to failure, and I don't think that is the case with the present system.

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ LODGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I was interested in what Dr. Sachs and Dr. Fell had to say on the subject, and also I was moved to tell what was told me a short time ago by one of the teachers who has been visiting English schools during the last few weeks. She took the occasion to visit Dr. Rouse's school and was present at a Greek class. The direct method in teaching Greek is, by reason of the narrower vogue of subject, rather more unusual. She said that the class during all the hour that she spent there uttered not a single word

in anything but Greek. The range of what was said was not wide, but the class didn't seem to be afraid of the language. When it was necessary to explain, and when the explanation in regard to the interpretation of a passage was too complex to be put into easy Greek for the class—that is, involved more than the class could understand—Dr. Rouse would talk in English for a while, but he always came back to Greek, and after he had got through the explanation he put the question in Greek to the individual, “Do you understand?” and the individual pupil would say, “I understand,” “I do not understand,” whichever the case might be.

Now, the important point is that this method of teaching is not merely a method, that is, the method is not the only thing. It is a means of studying a certain amount of Latin literature, and it is a means of attacking that literature not in a mechanical way but in an intelligent fashion. The use of Latin in the classroom through colloquial back-and-forth talking is not for the purpose of developing particularly a ready control of a certain narrow range of sentences, but it is for the purpose of playing over the subject, the passage under discussion, and divorcing the students from any idea that Latin and Latin reading are separate and distinct things. That is to say, the class is always studying some piece of Latin literature, and as a means of that study they are using Latin, and in the use of this Latin they have to twist and turn the various ideas of any particular passage into different forms; if they are verse, write them out into prose, or speak them; if they are prose, vary the order, vary the construction, turn from accusatives to nominatives, change the idiom and use, perhaps, another word involving the ablative or genitive—the very acme of intensive study of inflectional effect. That, as I understand it, was quite lacking in the Sauveur system. The value of such practice in obtaining control over the meaning of inflection is very great for reading new Latin, and from that point of view I am able to say, with regard to Dr. Fell's objection, that Dr. Rouse maintains from actual experience over a number of years that the amount of time that they have for the teaching of Latin in English schools is ample to produce this control of the language. That I don't know from actual experience, I have only tried it in limited classes, but he says, in discussing the change in the English curricula, which is being

advocated very strongly, that with the same amount of time that they have had they can do vastly more, and by natural consequence, with the amount of time that we have we can do vastly more with the new system than we can with the old, because the old system never induced any power and the new system, according to his statement, does induce power; likewise according to my own experience, so far as I have been able to test it.

I had a communication from a teacher three or four days ago who had seen the announcement on the program that I was to speak, and wrote that the class in *Cæsar* had entirely discarded its vocabulary and the class in *Vergil* was about to discard its vocabulary in the book, and that the spirit of the pupils had been wonderfully changed by the consciousness that they could do something with the Latin that they knew. Now, after all, that is an immense advantage, it seems to me, in cultivating the right kind of spirit among the pupils.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR., RUTGERS COLLEGE.—I have but a slight contribution to make to the discussion of Professor Lodge's paper, and the hour is so late that I shall confine myself to one or two things which I think should be pointed out. With his fundamental thesis I am personally very heartily in accord. I think it is only common sense that the elements, the words, and the phrases should be the things with which the pupils should somehow become familiar, and not a particular passage of a particular book, whether it be Latin, English, or Greek, or any other language; and if the purpose be to use a language orally and to understand it when spoken, it is fundamentally necessary that conversation be a large part of any effective teaching.

I can not, however, quite see the distinction that is made between the Sauveur teaching and the new device. I must confess that the distinction as drawn by Professor Sachs and Professor Lodge does not seem to me to be clear. In other words, I think there was great value in Dr. Sauveur's system, and that, intelligently applied, there is also great value in this, but on the conversational side no difference at all in principle.

There is one difficulty which is certainly very practical. From the intimate acquaintance that I have, necessarily, with the system of high schools in New Jersey, I must say, in all frankness, that any such revolution in method demands also a widely changed

method of preparation for the teachers. Any such system introduced at once would be farcical. It must come by a process of evolution and education. Perhaps a specific instance may be suggestive: I listened recently to a German lesson based wholly upon German conversation; no word of English was allowed in the exercise, which began by the announcement on the part of the teacher that "*Wir anfangen am Gipfel der Seite dreissig.*"

Now, I have seen Latin well taught with the splendid inspiration of real Latin conversation, but I have yet to see a boy in college, prepared by the *méthode naturelle*, who really learned to read Greek accurately during his college course. It has been practically, in my experience, a flat failure. Still I think the fault lies not so much with the method as with its unskillful use. I think the essential thesis of the paper is sound; but it is a long journey, Mr. President, before Latin teaching can be made really effective in the secondary schools on that basis.

DR. R. C. SCHIEDT, FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.—I learned Latin when I was eight years of age. . . . Not by any method of Sauveur's or any other method did we learn to use the Latin language conversationally; but we spoke Latin after one, two, three, four, five years of preparation, of about twelve hours a week—got a thorough knowledge of the forms and a wide acquaintance with Latin literature and slowly learned to think in Latin idioms. We simply were addressed in Latin by the teacher in the classroom, and he had his answer in Latin. At first it was rather slow; but he used to be very quick in his questions, and then he would say "jam perge," passing from boy to boy with lightning rapidity; and in the course of time, without anybody's special method, every boy in the class, in the gymnasium, answered in Latin, and in fact some spoke better Latin than they could speak German. I think that was the result twenty-five years ago. Since that time His Majesty has abolished the German-Latin composition from the German gymnasium. That composition, which required a man to write Latin on a given theme as well or better than he would write German, taught us to think in Latin. That Latin composition was counted a failure if there were five mistakes against the forms or against the syntax—a failure, no matter whether it consisted of a hundred pages or two pages. It was Latin composition or theme writing

which enabled the boys to converse in Latin and to express themselves with ease in Latin; and this habit of thinking and writing out a discussion on a theme which was thoroughly taught first in the classroom—as Dr. Sachs pointed out, it was that which enabled them afterwards to answer in Latin when any other subject was discussed in the classroom. There was no particular method, but simply the basis of a life training, the basis of hammering everlastingly on the same thing, the basis of learning a thousand or two thousand words in the first few years, before we knew, perhaps, even the conjugations—it was this everlasting hammering of twelve hours a week, morning and night (it had to sink in), which brought the result. There is no curriculum large enough to allow so much time to be given to a single branch. Moreover, I think that the English language in itself is not rich enough in its inflections to develop a large taste or a large appreciation for any other foreign language. I think that the average American boy is much more apt to grasp mathematical questions than he is to grasp language questions in the short time given to it. In my judgment it is largely due to the fact that his own mother tongue is too poor in its inflections to create special taste or superior capacity for language study, and that is one of the reasons why there are such terribly poor entrance examinations, as pointed out by Dr. Lodge. It is an awful thing from a German standpoint—to admit men to higher institutions of learning on such an examination.

SECOND SESSION

Friday, November 27, at 2.30 P. M.

THE PRESIDENT.—Ladies and gentlemen, with your permission I will reopen the session. I think perhaps the exercises of this afternoon should be described as an Executive Session; as the Senate of the United States closes its doors when it has something to discuss too precious for the common herd to hear. What we are to discuss is no less a subject than, "Are we Educating the Rising Generation?" I trust it will not be treated too sadly, or too dangerously. We have with us some gentlemen who certainly have the right to speak; and the subjects certainly are subjects that have a right to be heard. No subject is more profoundly interesting, philosophically or as a matter of practice, than the relation between the children as they are given us and the system which we construct, or partly construct to educate them. This interesting subject will be treated by Professor Lightner Witmer, of the University of Pennsylvania, who has very kindly consented to come and talk to us.

ARE WE EDUCATING THE RISING GENERATION?

(A) THE INDIVIDUAL VS. THE SYSTEM.

PROFESSOR LIGHTNER WITMER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

I am not one of those who seek a Golden Age in the past and yet when I compare the college education which I received over twenty years ago with that which I am assisting to give at the present time, I find that in at least one respect the older conditions were better than the present. The classes in which I was taught did not average more than twenty students to a class. The classes of to-day number fifty, a hundred, two hundred, even three hundred students. Is it possible to educate a mob of several hundred students in the same sense in which we can educate a group of twenty students? I believe not. There is an essential difference in the character and the quality of the work that can be undertaken with small and with large classes. The drift

of enormous numbers of students to our colleges has caused, in my opinion, a deterioration of the educational product which is in direct ratio to the increase in the number of students. The first effect of the large class is the more or less complete suppression of the individual. We instructors must possess an unusually good memory if we are to recall the names and recognize the faces of one-half the students whom we are supposed to be educating.

The development of the human mind is promoted in one of three ways: the gaining of information, which requires and cultivates a memory; the awakening of appreciation through inspiration and imitation, which involves the arousal of emotion; and last but certainly not the least important, is the training of the individual student to think, which requires the formation of habits of concentrated and sustained attention. I would not minimize the value of any one of these functions. I think, however, we are all agreed that the gaining of information for its own sake is the least important method of training the mind. Nevertheless, I believe it is generally acknowledged that the secondary schools and colleges do this portion of their work best. Important as is the training of the memory, it is to the other two factors that I wish to direct your attention. A college education as an inspirational provocative of emotion comes in competition with the theater, the art gallery, the university extension lecture, the orator, good books, athletics, and many other social and intellectual stimuli. There is need in every institution for instructors with a sympathetic appreciation of art and nature, and with a wide mental horizon covering all interests, in order that they may arouse the students to enthusiasm and appreciative interest. But there is danger of dissipation when this kind of work begins to occupy the larger part of the student's time. It unfits him for the really serious interests of life. It fails to train his mind in the sense that it does not discipline his thought; it does not teach him to think.

It is through action that the mind finds expression. It is through action that the mind and body are trained to higher endeavor. The psychological significance of motor activity has led to an increasing emphasis for manual work and gymnastics. Motor activity does more than train the muscles; it cultivates habits of attention and emotional control, it develops

moral character. Thinking is a form of action. To train the college student to think is not an easy matter. The human being, whether child, youth, or adult, resists and fatigues under unaccustomed exercise. The first skate or the first ride of the season always provokes a muscular fatigue which endures for several days. This appears to our senses as a fatigue of the muscles. As a matter of fact it is cerebral in origin; it is brain tire. Thinking, especially along unwonted channels, also excites the same brain tire. Every new process of thinking can be acquired only through the overcoming of an apparent resistance of the brain. We see this even in work of simple detail; a difficult, but accustomed task we run off with ease; something that is unusual, if it be merely the adding of a column of figures, is accomplished only with internal resistance and a rapidly ensuing fatigue. I have had teachers in my classes in psychology who could not be induced to write down on paper a single statement of fact concerning the very children about whom they gave me most detailed and voluminous reports, admirably presented in oral form. Now, it is really no more difficult to write than it is to talk. It is simply a question of what is habitual. Thus, the student can think easily and to good purpose about getting his meals, the details of a foot ball game, what he has seen at the theater, and the feminine society it has been his privilege to enjoy. All this puts no strain upon his brain. But to think out a problem in mathematics, to read an English play with understanding and appreciation, to orient himself in and work his way out of some economic problem, these are brain processes which every implication of the youthful organism seems to resist. We all know to what lengths the student will go in an expenditure of time and trouble to avoid thinking. It is important to stock the mind with ideas, but it is of immeasurably greater importance to teach the youth to use the ideas he may possess. We should strive to extract mental action from the youthful organism. It would be just as silly to give the student a didactic course on athletics in the hope of improving his muscles, as it is to stuff his mind with the subjects of the curriculum in the hope that by some alchemic process the brain will assimilate the material and transform it into expressive action.

Now, it is my contention that you can teach students to think in groups of twenty, but you can not teach a class of fifty to think,

and it is hopeless to arouse mobs of two or three hundred to anything more than the retention and emotional appreciation of the ideas that you may happen to present.

A critical situation has thus arisen within the last twenty years through the growth of our classes. We instructors are being asked to perform an impossible task. Various attempts have been made at a solution. To some extent, the laboratory has saved the situation. When this word calls up to our mind laboratories of physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology, let us not forget that the laboratory method may be and is employed also in the teaching of such subjects as history and English. Indeed, it always existed and gave chief value to the classics and mathematics. These subjects still possess a great educational value, not because of any intrinsic worth, but because generations of schoolmasters have developed a method by which the student may be forced to think and work, and under our elective system we see the result. Wherever the student is free to choose between any form of laboratory work and the lecture course, he will inevitably choose the lecture. In my experience, and I have tried to develop both forms of college work, the student rejects the laboratory, not because it is more difficult, but simply and solely because the laboratory makes him work. It is precisely for this reason that the laboratory, as I have just said, helps in a measure to save the situation.

While the laboratory thus fosters and demands work on the part of the student as an individual, the laboratory also suffers from the present inrush of students. No sooner does an instructor build and equip a laboratory which is adequate for a certain number of students, than he is compelled to admit double the number provided for. The aim of the laboratory (and this in itself is not objectionable) is to handle as many students as possible with a minimum expenditure for instructors, and as a consequence automatic manuals are devised to compel the student to work for himself. But no manual, no matter how automatically it may perform its appointed task, will dispense entirely with the instructor, and laboratory work, like the lecture, deteriorates in quality in proportion to the number of students. As between the laboratory, which may and does teach the student to think, and the lecture, which may and does arouse the student to appreciative enthusiasm, I must ascribe to the laboratory the higher educational

value; and I believe that teaching the student to think, whether in a laboratory or classroom, is more difficult than to put ideas before him in an entertaining and inspiring way. It is, therefore, safer to entrust to young instructors our larger classes than to turn over to them, as we do at the present day, our laboratory and quiz work, leaving for the professor the relatively easy task of giving popular lectures. If the instructor has in mind the development of the individual he has before him an extremely difficult task. He must by cross-examination, called a quiz, first discover the student's intellectual, emotional and moral characteristics; he must ascertain his interests and prejudices, and on the basis of this individualization he must lead him on to higher and higher planes of individual endeavor. Thinking is only worth while when we try to do something that is just a little beyond our present powers. If it is within the sphere of easy endeavor, or if it be too much above us, it has little or no educational value. Hence the necessity for an inquiry into the individuality of the student. We make a pretense of treating him as an individual through the system of free electives. Desirable as the free elective system is, and it has assisted the laboratory method in saving the situation, we must not beguile ourselves with the vain hope that either the laboratory or the free elective permits of real individual treatment. It permits of smaller groups, but the groups in both the laboratory and the elective course may be and are so large that the student has no more personal identity than a single brick in the façade of a building.

To facilitate the training of the student to think, some co-ordination must underlie the presentation of the subjects of the curriculum. The college student today is much like the boy in school who, when reproved in his history lesson for not knowing where Rome was, replied, with a great deal of indignation, that he had had geography the year before, clearly intimating that he should not be expected to know a subject from which he had already graduated. It is not my purpose to discuss the details of this lack of co-ordination in the curriculum. I am seeking in this paper only to point out certain broad tendencies which slowly but surely work out their inevitable results. For example, our faculties have grown so large that they have disintegrated. The executive committee or college council controls the educational policy, or rather lack of policy, of the college.

We have learned that "in order to live we must let live," and within his own province the head of each separate department in our institutions is supreme and determines the character and method of his courses to suit himself. Moreover, in the colleges connected with our large universities most of our instructors are chosen because of their ability in research, and not primarily because of their ability to give instruction. In fact, we seldom know the abilities or disabilities of our colleagues in the art of teaching, and we uproot rather than cultivate any natural inquisitiveness in this direction. We know and honor our colleagues as the authors of important monographs. When instructors are chosen by the heads of departments because they give promise of carrying out the lines of research fostered by the department, this naturally has great advantages, which I feel we ought not to underestimate, but so far as the college is concerned it carries with it the great disadvantage of fastening the attention of the instructor upon the subject and not upon the student. In carrying on any form of mental activity with success the primary psychological problem is the distribution and concentration of attention, and when self-interest and our highest aims and ideals fasten the attention upon the subject-matter the pupil will inevitably suffer from neglect. This greater emphasis upon subject-matter is not a new tendency. In fact, for many years discussions of the educational problem have had reference to the training value of this or that subject. If the student is taken into consideration at all he is always given an abstractly average mind, whose supposed qualities and activities are borrowed from a traditional and useless psychology. What we need is a comparative psychology, based upon a study of many different individuals. I believe that any one subject may have as great an educational value as any other subject; it depends entirely upon the way it is taught and the characteristics of the persons taught. The abstract value of a subject should be secondary to its satisfaction of the momentary needs of the individual student. I should not be surprised if many of our students got more of an education, in the sense of a training of attention, emotion and will, while on the athletic field than from any professor in the college faculty.

The psychology of retardation, as this problem is being presented to us in recent times, will inevitably shift the point of

view from which we judge the educational value of college work. The derivation of the concept of retardation we owe, in the first instance, to an accident. In the year 1797 a boy, apparently about 12 years of age, was found running wild in the forest of Hoeyron, in Southern France. He was unclothed, and resisted the placing of clothing upon his back. He spoke no intelligible language, but made his wants known through inarticulate cries. He sometimes ran upon all fours. He selected his food by the sense of smell and drank by immersing his mouth beneath the surface of the water. He gave but few signs of intelligence. No one ever knew his origin or where he had spent the time between his birth and discovery. He was brought to Paris and exhibited before the Academy of Science, where he awakened the greatest interest. Was this the natural man, uncontaminated by a false civilization? If so, the study of his natural faculties and his training would reveal what the normal human mind was like, as well as the nature of the developmental process. On the other hand, the boy might be an idiot, deprived of the essential human faculty of reason. If so, neglect would be his portion, for no one in that day regarded the idiot as trainable. A French physician, believing the boy to be merely untrained and undeveloped, took up the task of education. After four or five years of work the boy proved to be an idiot, but Itard, in the meantime, had proved him to be trainable. In 1842 Séguin, enlightened by this experiment, contended for the first time that idiocy was an arrest or retardation of development, and laid down certain principles for the stimulation of the retarded mental and physical processes.

Since 1896 I have been devoting some attention to the study of children who are not properly designated feeble-minded, but who fail to make normal progress in the school because of physical or mental defects, their social environment or wrong educational methods. I believe that we are now able to give a definition of retardation which is both illuminating and instructive for the treatment of the normal child. Take a perfectly normal child of 6 years of age and let him arrive at the age of 10 with the same characteristics that he had at 6, and he will manifest retardation. Let him arrive at the age of 20 with characteristics entirely normal for a child of 6, and his retardation will not only be all the more severe, but will be the cause

of a permanent arrest of development, for the reason that he will then have passed the formative or developmental period. No child who fails to acquire a language before he is 14 or 15 years of age is likely to become facile in human speech. We all of us manifest an arrest of this kind toward foreign languages which are not acquired before the age of 10. What may be retardation for one may not be retardation for another. Children and youths of any given age vary greatly in physiological and psychological development. The physiological and psychological age does not correspond with the chronological age. Retardation must, therefore, be defined in terms of individual capacity for development. Any child whose brain is not developed up to the full limit of its capacity for his age is suffering from retardation, and a youth who arrives at the age of maturity with his brain below the level of development which it might have attained if other methods had been applied, will carry through life a permanent arrest of mental and moral development. Consequently, it may very well happen that the child who stands at the head of his class in school may be more retarded than the child who is at the bottom of his class. Indeed, I believe that the schools give less education to those who are better endowed than they give to the average student or dullard. The bright ones get an education, but they learn in the schools as they learn on the streets. "I do not know whether my boy *took* French in college or not," said the father in answer to a question, "but he was *exposed* to it." It is the function of the school and college to *educate*, not merely to make it possible for the child or youth to obtain an education.

While this concept of retardation in terms of individual development may be made clear enough, it can not be made definite, because it is impossible for us to estimate the natural endowment of any brain, except in terms of what it produces in thought and action. I have sought an objective standard, therefore, more particularly for public school children, in terms of age and grade. An elementary education presumably extends over a period of eight years. The child enters at 6 and finishes at 14, but how many children fulfil this requirement? In five cities studied by Doctor Cornman, comprising 5 per cent. of the school population of the United States, 61 per cent. are beyond the theoretic age limit, 13½ per cent. are two years or more behind the grade in

which they are supposed to be, and 5 per cent. are three years or more behind this grade. The presentation of these facts to the educators of the country will undoubtedly shift the center of educational discussion from the curriculum to the cause and remedial treatment of retardation. Already in New York City the Russell Sage Foundation has undertaken an investigation of this problem. The State superintendent of New York and the National Bureau of Education are sending out blanks to ascertain the number of over-age pupils in the grades.

What is true of the public elementary schools is doubtless true of the secondary schools and colleges, public and private. The search for the causes of retardation leads to an investigation of physical and mental defects and of social conditions. We are apt to turn aside from this problem with pity, but with a feeling of hopelessness, because we believe that these conditions are a necessary sequella of poverty. As a matter of fact they exist among the very rich to as great an extent as among the poor. If I had to choose whether the childhood of a boy of unusual brain capacity should be spent among the very rich, with their nurses, governesses, tutors, fashionable fitting schools and colleges, or whether he should be born and live in a home, waging a continual fight against poverty, but yet able to send him to the public schools and college, I should choose for him the latter fate in full confidence that he would reach maturity with greater force of character and a brain developed to a higher level of intellectual activity. I have studied and tried to help individual cases of retardation among the children of the rich, as a result of which I have acquired a great respect for the efficiency of the methods employed to enable the youth to jump the barrier of an entrance examination and get into college without the least semblance of a real education, and often in a condition of approximate illiteracy.

While I believe that the conditions in the private schools are quite analogous to those in the public schools, I have not yet succeeded in devising a satisfactory method for their investigation on a large scale, nor have I been able to take up this problem with reference to the college student, but undoubtedly the problem is there and awaits a solution. No single investigator or any group of psychologists can solve this problem satisfactorily. Every instructor who comes in contact with these students must

contribute his quota to our knowledge of intellectual and moral development in individual cases. The Legislature of the State of Massachusetts has recently required that every teacher shall examine the pupils in her grade at least once a year with respect to their sight and hearing. The day is coming when the grade teacher will be the repository of the best information available concerning the physical and mental characteristics of children. From the home we may expect but little assistance, for parents are too ignorant and the task of educating them is too great to be undertaken. But psychological insight will find its way into the schoolroom, for there is no doubt that some day we shall be able to educate the teacher to an understanding of the processes of individual development.

We who are college instructors should remember that we are first of all professional teachers of youth, and only secondarily scholars in this or that field of knowledge. There is no teacher in any college who should not be able to study the mental and emotional characteristics of his students and to ascertain the incidence and effect of the instruction which he imparts. In fact, the day is fast coming when he must be something of a psychologist in order to be a good teacher, and his function as a teacher with psychological insight will take precedence over his function as mathematician, biologist or classicist.

This shifting of the center of attention in college work will take place gradually. I would not, if I could, propose any scheme of reorganization in line with the suggestions that I have been throwing out in the course of this discussion. There is one modification, however, which I consider a step in the right direction, and which I risk placing before you for consideration. After an experience of some years in teaching the subject of psychology I can say that it makes very little difference to me whether a class is composed of sophomores, juniors, seniors, graduate students or teachers. Taking all these classes as they come, they do about the same grade of work. You can get more work out of a graduate student than you can out of a college student, because the graduate has less distraction and a more serious view of life. But so far as readiness of apprehension is concerned, I have had sophomores who were far more apt than some of my graduate students. I have had grade teachers who showed themselves to have a grasp of the subject superior to

that possessed by the average graduate or college student. In other words, a sophomore may be as mature intellectually as a senior or a graduate. So far as *preparation* goes, it is, in my experience, of negligible value. I do not find that those of my students who have had physics show any better grasp of the facts and principles of physics, as these are required for an understanding of the principles of psychology, than do those students who have had little or no physics.

But there is a line of cleavage, a basis of qualification, which is significant. I have poor students, mediocre students and good students. I should like to divide my classes into three groups with reference to their mental ability. I would teach these three classes by entirely different methods. I could give the members of each group an education in the sense in which I have been using that word for the purpose of this discussion. At present the average student gets something out of the work, but the good student is bored and not given sufficient mental exercise, while the poor student is "jacked" through the examination or pruned away with the mark of failure. We could certainly make a beginning by distinguishing between the honor and pass men. We give at Pennsylvania the marks *distinguished*, *good* and *passed* for work that has covered exactly the same ground. In my opinion the distinguished mark has little or no significance. It is and must be too easy to attain so long as we are required by the exigencies of the situation to pass the larger percentage of all the students coming to us. But the situation would entirely change if we could divide the class into honor and pass sections, and this is easily possible with our large classes. A pass mark in one section would give the student *distinguished*; in the other a mere *passed*, or perhaps in exceptional cases the mark *good*. This one step alone would enable us to take a more serious attitude toward the education of our students with reference to their individual needs. It would stimulate both sections, because for the one it would set up a high standard of attainment, which would be worth striving for, while for the other it would provide a standard possible of attainment. It would have the effect of counteracting the inevitable tendency of large classes to pull down the average pass qualifications of the class. We necessarily gauge what our students can do by what they actually do. Our students know this, and the mediocre

and poor students exert pressure upon the brighter ones to prevent their working as hard as they can, because this would have the result of raising the standard of class attainment beyond the level which the poorer ones can easily reach.

What I have said by way of criticism in the course of this discussion has been with no feeling of hopelessness over the present situation. We are educating more college students in a better way than we ever did before. It is precisely because the system is as good as it is that we can afford to inquire into the causes of our failures. These failures are doubtless more numerous than in our student days, but I doubt very much if the proportion of failures to the whole number of students is as large today as it was then.

THE PRESIDENT.—I am sure we are very much obliged to Doctor Witmer for his most thoughtful and stimulating paper.

An interesting thing about the English is that as a nation they have never thought at all about "Education," and they are proud of it. And yet, nevertheless, they have produced and are producing some—I say some, many—of the most perfectly educated men of this century, men who in every way measure up to any standard of culture—the highest standards of culture the human race can conceive.

We shall have the great pleasure of hearing Doctor Canfield, who has been concerned in a comprehensive investigation recently of "Some Famous English Schools."

SOME FAMOUS ENGLISH SCHOOLS.*

DR. JAMES H. CANFIELD, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Mr. President and Members of the Association: I have been asked to talk to you, briefly and very informally, about some of the more peculiar features of the great English schools. In considering these schools, to which such complimentary and worthy reference has been made by your President, you will find that there are three general divisions of what we in this country know as the public school system, or the public schools. There are the great public schools, such as St. Paul's, founded by Bishop Colet, which reckons among its great names those of Milton, Churchill, Burke and Bishop Butler; Harrow, with Byron and Peale and Sheridan and Palmerstone and Cardinal Manning; Eton, with Chatham, Fox, Shelley and Wellington; Rugby, with Thomas Arnold and Matthew Arnold and Tom Hughes and Dean Stanley. Then you will find another class, of later date, such as the Mill Hill School, near London, the great school of the Nonconformists, founded, I believe, by Lord Brougham; such as University College School, which follows the development of the University of London; such as the school known as Clifton College, in the suburbs, or in what is now practically a part of the corporate limits of Bristol; and such as the Manchester Grammar School, which is old enough, strong enough and noted enough to have had DeQuincey as its most celebrated graduate. And there is a third class, known as the secondary schools, such as the Secondary School of Manchester, the Secondary School of Birmingham, the secondary schools in London itself.

Each class seems to have quite a definite place and distinct place and a definite and distinct purpose. As illustration: If a lad is coming up through the schools of Birmingham and his parents have determined—or his teachers have determined—or his teachers and he himself perhaps have determined, for in England the teacher and the pupil generally determine the college to which the boy shall go, if he goes; the parents and the pupil and the teacher sometimes determine; the boy alone never determines, which is quite a marked difference between the Eng-

* Stenographer's Report.

lish boy and the American boy. If the parents and his teachers have determined that the boy in Birmingham shall go to Oxford or to Cambridge he will be entered at King Edward's School, the old grammar school of the town. If he is going into Birmingham University he will be entered at Birmingham High School, we should call it; in the Birmingham Grammar School they call it. If he is not going to either, but is simply going out into the business world, he will be entered in the secondary school, which is something like our commercial high school, though not going quite as far nor doing as strong work. That general division is true of nearly all the greater cities—the more important towns—Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham, London itself. Each will show these three divisions.

Of these three classes you and I naturally turn first to the schools about which we know most, the schools of that first class, the older public schools. Of course, these are not public schools at all, but very, very private schools. They are not free schools, but fee schools, fees in them running from \$500 to \$800 a year for those who are boarders and from \$125 up for those who are day pupils. The country schools, as they are called, such as Rugby, Harrow and Eton, have mostly boarders. King Edward's School, at Birmingham, and some of the minor or younger schools or "colleges," like Clifton, at Bristol, have mostly day scholars.

With regard to these schools—all of them—let me make a few statements of facts, leaving you to determine the possible helpfulness of comparison with our own and to institute the specific comparisons if you wish. And I will begin by saying that in England they realize quite keenly that education is a matter not so much of impact with a book or with problems and formulae as with a great-hearted, large-minded man of strong character; that after all else has been counted and weighed we find that what is needed is human interest, and we know that that which has stimulated the world in all the past and that to which we must look for stimulus and uplift in all the future is human character, and human character sympathetically manifested in relations between human individuals. That the strongest influence which can be brought to bear upon a lad to insure him a favorable start on the rather stormy voyage of life is that which comes from and with a constant and unselfish and loving contact

with some high types of manhood and womanhood. His teachers must have ample preparation for the work entrusted to each; there must be fullness and accuracy of information, general scholarship and special equipment must go hand in hand; but back of these and beneath these and permeating these ought to be the largest possible personality, in the largest and best sense of that word. There should be exactness of statement, but there should be also an everpresent sense of opportunity and duty and responsibility. Unceasing industry should stand side by side with unwearied patience. Most unswerving good faith and perfect candor, the strictest integrity, impartial justice, these must be quite as manifest as mere erudition. It is far better for an instructor to say frankly, on occasion, "I do not know," than to be lacking in that spirit which makes him ready and willing and even glad to be worn out in generous and gratuitous service, or in that reverence which gives man his true place in the economy of God. And all this strength and beauty and enthusiasm of character should be combined with such qualities as promptness and order, and tempered with friendship, sympathy and an affectionate regard for those under instruction. These characteristics, thus daily manifested, will bring the lad who is so fortunate as to be under their influence not into a condition of slavish discipline, but rather into a voluntary and very happy conformity with all that is right and just and sane and wholesome.

All this the English understand quite well, but it is not always easy to secure the men they wish. I said to an English headmaster: "Why is it that you do not have first-class winners of men in every teaching position in your school?" His answer was worthy of a man from Maine or Massachusetts. In a dry way he said: "Because we have no right to absorb in this one school all the people of that character and strength in the British nation." In other words, there are not enough first-class winners of men to go around; there are not enough men with positive teaching power to equip all of the faculties (if I may use that term) of the schools of England.

They find it hard to secure masters and to keep masters, because of the demands of the outside world. The outside world is offering today, through its great commercial organizations, through remarkable opportunities in professional fields, not only large financial returns—and I emphasize "not only" because I

can not believe that financial returns alone are determining the activities of the best men of England—but a larger opportunity for the exercise of personal power. When a man feels that he has power he has a natural desire to exercise his power, and can hardly be satisfied without this. If his hand upon the throttle compels the engine to yield to his will, determines its speed and its mastery of time and space, he is not going to take his hand off that lever for a minor piece of work, something that does not satisfy, that does not give the same returns to his personality. In England they say that they can not find as large and satisfactory returns for large and strong personalities in the positions of masters as the masters can find elsewhere, and so they go elsewhere. Not criticizing at all the condition of the schools, not finding fault and saying that there is ignorance and indifference, simply that the facts are against them, that is all; the conditions at present are against the schools.

They are finding also that the civil service is attracting more and more men, and especially—strange as it may seem—men who have a decided literary tendency and who wish to use their brains. They say: "We can not expect to go out of Oxford and Cambridge and live off our brains immediately; it would be pretty hard work; but we can find a place in the home civil service which will please us, which will give us an official position at London, or Liverpool, or Manchester, or Birmingham, or Leeds, or Bristol, or some of the other seaport towns which are pleasant to live in and are the centers of a good deal of intellectual life; and this position, with shorter hours and with no responsibility after hours are over, will give us a livelihood and leave us free mornings, afternoons, evenings and holidays, to follow our bent in the literary way;" and so many young graduates of the two great universities, young fellows who used to take up teaching, are now going into the public service. More credit is attached to such work since it came under specific and intelligent direction and regulation. In other words, by the development of a systematic and intelligent and clean and uplifting civil service England is commanding more highly trained and competent men. They are taking into the service of the government men who used to go into the teaching field. Certainly the government itself is to be congratulated, whatever the result may be upon the work of education.

Another reason why there is difficulty in getting strong assistant masters is that almost the only outlook for promotion, if they stay in the teaching profession, is the position of housemaster. The housemaster is one who has been at his work long enough (generally he is at least 40 before he reaches that position), has been sufficiently tested to make it safe to put him in charge of one of the houses in which the boys live. As a matter of fact, it is quite generally asserted that he is nothing more than a sublimated boarding-house keeper. His income may run up to \$10,000 a year, but there is a very general feeling that this is detrimental to all true educational work, and there is a very general desire in England to change this. In some of the schools either housekeepers take the place of headmasters or their salaries are not determined or increased by their economic financial administration.

As to compensation, teachers start in the schools as assistant masters, perhaps at \$500 a year, which includes, of course, room and board and general personal expenses during term time. This increases slowly, possibly \$100 a year, up to sometimes \$1,500, rarely \$2,000. I heard of very few indeed who have gone as far as \$2,500.

Assistant masters find promotion along two lines—their ability to teach and their ability in managing boys; and strange as it may seem to some of us in this country, the two do not always coincide. They are not promoted because of special erudition, and they are not promoted because of research work. The headmaster of a school said to me: "I wouldn't count it *against* one of my men if he had done a good bit of work in the literary way." I replied: "I am very glad that you wouldn't; it would be rather discouraging if you should." "Oh, no! Oh, no! I wouldn't count it against him at all; not at all. I can even conceive that he might do it, under proper circumstances, when it would be helpful to him; but, generally speaking, it would not be helpful to him, because I want all his time and strength given to his work and to his class each day." Then I recalled a remark that I heard made once by Dr. John Raymond, the first president of Vassar College, under whose presidency of the old Brooklyn Polytechnic I prepared for college. Some one said to him: "Doctor Raymond, why don't you *produce* something? Why don't you write something?" He answered: "Well, I don't

write anything because I wish to give my whole time and strength to my classes each day; but," he added, "I *have* produced two United States Senators, one Governor and at least a hundred men peculiarly competent in business and professional circles." The best possible form of production, it seems to me, for the teacher, the intelligent teacher, the born teacher, the winner of men.

And these associate masters are neither employed nor promoted until those who are responsible have determined one thing more, and that interested me exceedingly. They don't ask that a man shall be subject to any ecclesiastical test; they don't ask, generally speaking, that a man shall be subject to a credal test. But they do say that if he is still largely in doubt, if he has settled little or nothing, if he has not found himself and knows not which way he is going, he can not be a wise or proper guide for youth. They hold that a man whose belief is simply a negation, who has not yet put his feet firmly upon any high spiritual ground, is not the man to come into daily contact with boys in the way of leadership.

There is coming in England one other thought, one other method of advancement for the masters. The universities are just beginning to understand that sometimes it may be wise to select tutors at least from the big public schools; that there is a chance at least that a man who has been successful in instruction in the high schools, as we should call them, will be as successful in instruction in the college. So it happens that in Oxford and Cambridge there are a few men who have gone there from the schools. Though these are minor positions, they really constitute recognition and promotion. This certainly will make it easier for the public schools, or, as we would say, the secondary school or the high school, to secure good men.

I was told, however, that there was only one full professor (and he is in Manchester University) in any higher institution in England who was taken out of the lower schools. When I heard this it gave me great satisfaction to recall that the president of Chicago University was taken into a full professorship in one of the great universities out of an American high school; that the president of Iowa State University went to his first educational work out of the American high school, and that one of the most successful teachers—full professor of English today

in one of the best of our minor colleges—was called from an American high school. I do not believe that this Association can hope for any better result from the commingling of the two grades of institutions which this Association accomplishes than that there shall come to be an open passageway between the high school and the college for the men who are successful in the lower, because they are peculiarly of the temper, attitude and power which are needed in the higher.

In England they tell us that masters may be retained too long; that older men can not win boys. Generally speaking, they would decline to put a man who is past 40 in contact with boys. They are willing to put him in contact with young men, but not with *boys*; and therefore, generally, you find the younger teachers in the great public schools. And they are coming also to be willing to say that by nature and by temperament an Englishman is a poor teacher, that a Scotchman is a better teacher, and that an Irishman is the best of all. They hold that the Irish, with their sympathy, with a certain kind of alertness, with a temperament which, if not really visionary, at least is a temperament that makes one dream dreams and see visions, that the Irishman, when he is trained for his work, makes the *best* teacher that can be found. They are very glad to get him, very glad to use him in all their schools.

As I listened to one of the papers read here today I thought of what an English headmaster told me about the attitude of the English toward what we would call pedagogy. They call a teacher of pedagogy the "Method-master," and he said: "The average English teacher has very little use for the method-master, because the average English teacher knows very little about method." Keatinge, of Oxford, has had a hard bit of work, though he has been very successful, in building up an interest in instruction in methods for those who are to go out to teach. University men and what we would call high-grade men still have the impression not perhaps that anybody can teach, but that *almost* anybody can teach; that the teacher is born and not made, which is probably true, and that, being born, the teacher can not be improved, even by instruction in methods. That is not an unusual position, however, for college officers to take, even in this country. When I heard the statement made a few moments ago that the time must soon come when we of the colleges must

teach the teachers how to study their subject properly, and how to master it from the standpoint of theory, it came over me suddenly that a few years ago I carefully examined the subscription books of several of our leading educational publications and found that the teachers of the common schools in this country are the people who are taking the journals on pedagogy, the journals on methods, the best educational journals; and found that the officers of colleges and universities—well, I could not find them at all. Their names were not there. The public school teachers are going to teach us of the colleges before we of the colleges will teach them, in the way of methods at least. But the Englishman is moving very slowly along that line; he has very little use indeed for the method-master.

I have said that a good bit of literary work would not get in the way of the advancement of an English master, and that is true; but what we call promotion because of research work is almost unknown there, except in the universities, and there only among the more advanced men. The work which they do (and they do a great deal of it) is a by-product. A man writes some acceptable article for the magazines, or he writes a monograph on some special subject; but he does it because he is thoroughly interested in that subject, and the monograph or the magazine article grows out of his regular work and is a by-product in a most literal sense of that word. In other countries, or in one other country at least, there is a tendency to promote by publication. A young instructor says: "To the bookmakers belong the spoils. I desire advancement, a doctorate, which is conditioned upon something in print. Go to! therefore—let us print." Well, nothing of that sort is known on the other side. There is a great deal of intellectual activity, but it comes naturally and easily and as an outgrowth of the daily life of the teacher. As to promotion—he knows that if his entire time and strength, his sympathy and his ingenuity, are daily given to his students, full measure, pressed down and running over, he will be neither forgotten nor ignored. On the other hand, it must be admitted that as a class the masters of England are not peculiarly active intellectually along lines where in some other countries we look for mental activity. It was all summed up rather harshly by a headmaster, who said: "The masters and tutors of England are practically unknown at the British Museum: that tells the whole story."

For many reasons, some valid and others peculiar—to say the least—it is not easy to sit in classes, or to get in contact with the masters. But when you do, you find them earnest, sincere, patient men, of sane ambition and thorough training; men who are undertaking, in the very best lines known to them, to carry out the work of their day. In the older public schools, the more noted public schools, it must be confessed that you find antiquity of every possible kind and degree. As much antiquity of method as there is of buildings, and some of the buildings were put up in 1640; as much age in heating, lighting, and seating classrooms and in equipment and apparatus as in stained glass windows—and one wonders if as little light comes through one as through the other! There are great names, great and worthy traditions, and a great and worthy spirit; and these are of almost infinite value! But there are quite desirable things which are not to be found; and I was not surprised to have some of the more modern teachers in England say that the great public schools, the old public schools, are standing squarely across the path of modern education because they are standing still. How far, just how far, that may be true I dare not say, I can not say.

In these schools there is one unquestionably pernicious practice: that of “going in for honors,” as it is called—which simply means premature, very premature, specialization. It is a system by which there is an artificial production of precocious scholars, forced under the stimulus of the recognition and reputation of the master, which is dependent upon this particular result of his work. It means that about one-fourth or one-fifth of the pupils are allowed to do that which they like to do, are stimulated in doing that to which they take naturally, are given much time and attention in building them along those lines; and the rest of the class are largely neglected and become what are known as “pass men,” and the “pass man” at Oxford, Cambridge, or anywhere in the educational world is a very pernicious influence, a constant menace to sound education. The mere “pass man,” who barely holds his own, without proper preparation, without interest, who simply takes what is given him without assimilation and holds it just long enough to get through his examination, who accumulates just points enough to secure a degree: wherever he appears, such a man should be cured or withdrawn—promptly.

There is another phase of this “honor” work which thoughtful

English educators are now studying most carefully. Just as the general result of studying for examinations is narrowing and dispiriting, so the result of studying for prizes and scholarships needs sharp limitation in order to reduce its danger to the lowest point. The rewards of scholastic effort should be the means by which poor men may receive an education otherwise impossible to them, and should never be used otherwise. The clear (confidential, perhaps) proof of financial need should be required and should be forthcoming. Even then the recipient should understand that he will be expected to return the amount received, without interest perhaps, as soon as he can do so without serious self-denial, in order that others may profit by this increased or recurrent fund. In other words, prizes and scholarships should not be permitted to add artificial stimulus to the work of those financially able, or to increase their bondage to a formal standard mathematically expressed, but should be plainly assistance given to students who have honorably shown their worth and promise and power while working under a free system, stimulated only by the possibility of continuing such work longer than would otherwise be possible. The interest and feeling with regard to these matters is so intense in England today that many most deeply interested think it quite possible that the whole question of prizes and scholarships will be entirely revolutionized within ten years.

The method of selection by which the English advance pupils of the common schools, as we would call them, beyond the grades—to an American is an exceedingly interesting one. Take London as an illustration: London selects 2,000 pupils a year to enter the public schools—work above that of what we would call the grades. These are chosen at the age of twelve, after not only the usual school examinations, but after careful personal observation, possible in the relations of the teacher to the pupil, and extended to inquiry made of and concerning his family. Those selected for advancement are allowed to choose their public schools, and their fees are paid by the city. The English say it is less expensive to pay the fees than to maintain high schools. In addition to the fees, "maintenance grants" are made, from \$70 to \$75 a year in the lower forms to a maximum of \$300 in the higher. Something of that system prevails in nearly all English cities. The American public school system is like a magic wand

that we wave over all American society, and the best comes to the surface, precisely as particles of steel rise from the dust to kiss the face of a magnet. We still believe that the unlikeliest spots often contain the likeliest possibilities of American manhood and American womanhood; and we believe all must have opportunity if the best are to be found for worthy life and public service. The English can not accept that, can not quite believe that. They make the selection, and by the temper and promise of the child as these have appeared in the school they undertake to determine his future.

It is very much to the credit of all these English schools that there is less attempt to discover acquisition by the examination, and more attempt to discover power. They do not care quite so much for what the pupil is able to remember as for what he is able to do with the knowledge that he has; and they are now adding a third element and trying to cover it by personal and literary examination, or by both; that is, the element of promise. Not what he has accumulated, but what can be done with his accumulation, and what is his promise for the future. Very seriously, indeed, they are undertaking the task of making the examination in public schools determine these points.

How does all this bear upon citizenship in England? In this way: They are not teaching civics—almost not at all; they are giving but little instruction in the mother tongue; and they are not teaching history as we are teaching history, and they give very little attention to local history. They believe that these things can not be taught by books; that such instruction can not be given by any rule-of-thumb method; that at the age of a child in the schools it is difficult for him to comprehend much if anything about these matters. They are going on the principle that a patriotic and intelligent citizen as a teacher makes patriotic and intelligent pupils; and that no other method can accomplish the same result. They are trying to bring these children into close contact with men (rather more than with women; but with men and women, of course) whose daily life and speech is such as to be stimulating and encouraging and uplifting; men who are optimistic, who are earnest, who are intense, who are sympathetic, and who, because of their love of country and because of their intimate knowledge of the conditions of public life, will in teaching geography, history, and English—in all that they do, in all that they teach—will neces-

sarily turn more or less toward those subjects and themes which make for good citizenship. They are making excellent use of their great public monuments, the records of the past, in Westminster, in Trafalgar Square, in Bristol, or in Plymouth; commemorating glorious deeds of the past, and constantly seen of all men; all these they are constantly using in connection with the child-life of to-day. Through this personal influence, by these heroic voices from the days bygone but never forgotten, they are undertaking to create a sentiment in favor of that large and intelligent and generous life in England which shall mean ultimately, as it must mean everywhere, large and intelligent and generous public service.

THE PRESIDENT.—Before we separate for the afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, we have one more privilege. We must come back to our own country and hear from the Carnegie Foundation—that most interesting, perhaps, of all recent American growths. The Carnegie Foundation gives us not only the hope of the “haven where we would all be,” but it has collected, in the process of investigating American education, some of the most edifying statistics. I have the great pleasure of introducing this afternoon Mr. Bowman, who has some thoughts and figures to lay before us bearing upon this main question of the afternoon. Mr. Bowman, of the Carnegie Foundation.

THE BASIS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION.

MR. JOHN C. BOWMAN, SECRETARY OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION
FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING.

The progress toward uniformity in college requirements for admission has been so far successful that practically all colleges and universities of adequate financial resources have either adopted a minimum standard resting upon the four-year high school or are making toward it as rapidly as local and institutional conditions will permit. Meanwhile the existence of irregularities in the admission of conditioned and of special students must be regarded as an anomaly that tends to make the uniformity nominal, rather than actual. I venture to question the wisdom of the varying treatment of an educational standard already agreed upon and announced.

Admission with conditions is intended, in theory at least, to render unnecessary the loss of a year to students who fail by a small margin to fulfill the regular requirements for admission. Such practice a generation ago had far more justification than at the present time. When high schools were comparatively few in number and courses in them meager, the colleges supplemented the work in these schools and permitted students to enter courses for which they had not opportunity for complete preparation. There was no idea of competition between the high schools and colleges for students; and under such conditions no one would doubt the value of discretion on the part of a college faculty in admitting deficient students. But since that time the development of secondary schools has radically changed the relations between colleges and schools. A concession designed for narrow application has been so widely extended in practice that a large part of the incoming class of a college is frequently conditioned; and leniency, theoretically justifiable if involving one of two slight conditions, has developed into indiscriminate charity. Such practice tends to defeat a real co-operation between the schools and colleges.

If we consider the stated requirements for admission to two hundred of the leading colleges and universities of this country, we have an apparent approval of a college standard based upon

a secondary school system; the entrance requirements, as stated, form an excellent basis of agreement as to the point at which college education should begin; college work is differentiated from high school work. But this uniformity disappears when a large part of the student body may gain admission, not by meeting the stated requirements, but on terms which vary from one institution to another. At Amherst, for example, application for conditional admission is "considered on its merits;" at Cornell the decision rests with the faculty concerned; at Johns Hopkins with a committee; Drake University waives two units; Marietta College concedes three units; Trinity College four; and the catalogues of New York University, Hobart, Lehigh, Princeton, Smith, Pennsylvania, Vassar, and the University of California, and others, give no information as to how the matter is handled.

All of the colleges in the group state definitely the requirements for regular admission, and when no reference is made to a provision for conditioned students there may be some implication that no such provision exists. But the fact is that practically all of the institutions in the group accept conditioned students and the omission is not serious or misleading. The objection has been made to a full statement of the requirements in the catalogue that this would tend to endanger a thoroughly honest stand in the admission of students; that it is wiser to admit a bright, strong student with two or three conditions than to admit another who may have only one condition, but who is reported as slow, or careless, or not physically strong; and further, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to formulate regulations which will indicate definitely the working of a wise and flexible discretion of a faculty.

These objections are not without force, and probable account for the fact that in so many instances no reference is made to the provision. But in my judgment the time has come when the entire question should be reconsidered by college authorities with a view to their best interests and the interests of the secondary schools. A few instances of the results of present practice may be helpful.

At Harvard a point is equivalent to about .6 of a unit; 26 points, or 16 units, make up the full quota of requirements for admission. Of the 607 freshmen admitted in the fall of 1907, 58 per cent. presented less than these 26 points, or 16 units. In some cases less than 19 points, or 10.8 units, were presented. The conditions

were not restricted to any one subject, or to any particular group of subjects. On the other hand, 107 members of the class presented more than the required 26 points.

Out of 697 students admitted directly from the secondary schools into the freshman class at Yale University this year, 391 were conditioned. In other words, 57 per cent. of the incoming class at Yale did not meet the stated requirements of 14.5 units. At Columbia, 145 men were admitted by examination into the *college* of the university. Seventy of these 145 freshmen met fully the requirements of 14.5 units. Of the 75 freshmen who did not present the full standard, the deficiencies ranged from half a unit to 7 units. Nineteen men were deficient in 4 units or more—that is, in at least one full year's work. In addition to this, 10 boys, from 17 to 19 years of age, who succeeded in passing in the examinations only 3.5 to 8.5 units were admitted as "non-matriculated students." Similarly at Amherst 49 out of 165 were admitted with conditions. Twelve of the 49 students were deficient 3 or more units. At the University of Illinois, 218 students were conditioned out of a total of 482; at Wellesley, 88 out of 383; at Cornell, 153 out of 862; at Princeton, 201 out of 360; and at New York University 36 out of 41 students in the *College* of the University. In the above instances students admitted from other colleges and those admitted as special students are not taken into consideration. In some instances, as at Cornell and the University of Illinois, the number of conditioned students includes those whose academic work, while not satisfying in full the prescribed entrance requirements, provides surplus entrance credit in other subjects. Such students are, of course, only technically deficient.

These figures, while they represent the practice at each institution named, do not readily lend themselves as a means of comparing the practice at institutions which admit by examination only with institutions which accept certificates for admission. Thus, at Columbia students are admitted only upon examination. The great proportion of students who are conditioned at Columbia have studied the various subjects. At New York University, on the other hand, students are admitted with certificates. Under this plan, when a student is conditioned it means, generally, that he has not studied at all the subjects in which he is deficient. There is evidently less justification for a conditioned enrollment

in the latter case than in the former. In the Middle West the universities have made much effort to perfect the certificate system, and in the first-class institutions adopting this system the admission of conditioned students tends to disappear. The University of Wisconsin and Oberlin College are types of this kind.

The data given, however, indicate with sufficient clearness that there is a wide margin between the announced standards of entrance and the actual bases of admission. In this twilight zone of irresponsibility there is a full field for the exercise not only of wise discretion, but also of indiscriminate excuse for unfaithful work, and above all an opportunity for the sharp-witted boy to play the college against the high school at the expense of both. Many of the boys admitted with heavy conditions even in the strongest institutions come from first-class high schools and academies, to which they should have been returned until they were ready for college. Some who were not able to make creditable marks in high schools sought and obtained admission to college after a half-completed course. In one case a candidate for admission as a special student frankly gave as a reason for his application the fact that he had failed to pass the entrance examinations. The sympathetic committee was unable to turn away from so ingenuous a plea. He was admitted.

The data concerning the variations in regard to the time in which deficiencies may be removed are of interest. In many instances no information is given. At Tulane three years are allowed for the removal of entrance conditions; at the University of Pittsburg, two years; and at the University of Kansas, one year. At the University of Alabama the deficiencies must be removed within a "reasonable time;" at the University of Oklahoma they must be removed as rapidly as the "committee may think best;" and at Drake University they must be removed "at once." These details are interesting in bringing out the confusion and the varying attempts to solve a difficult problem.

But the provisions by which the deficiencies may be removed, apart from the element of time, are of more serious importance. At institutions which maintain preparatory departments, such as Oberlin and Iowa College, the difficulty is easily met; and similarly by institutions which arrange special classes in preparatory work. But the disadvantages of combining college work and high school work are too numerous for discussion here, and as

colleges grow in strength they tend to discontinue all preparatory classes.

A number of colleges and universities have attempted to overcome the difficulty by stated examinations. Experience, however, has shown objections to this plan. First, the expense of a competent tutor to the student; second, the double disadvantage of meager preparation for college work and a two-fold schedule in the college and in the secondary school is apt to bring discouragement or failure to a student of ability. The result has been that both the tutoring and the examinations are perfunctory.

Harvard University has adopted a plan by which college courses may be "sacrificed" for certain courses required for admission; college work is accepted for entrance credit. Thus, a boy who fails in the examination in Virgil may satisfy the requirement by passing in *Latin B* of the Harvard curriculum. In this case *Latin B* is not credited to the boy toward his degree. At the University of Texas two-thirds of a university course absolves an entrance condition of one unit.

At Columbia an arrangement somewhat similar to the Harvard plan prevails. But if the student makes a fairly creditable failure in the entrance examination, he need not "sacrifice" the cognate college course in order to remove the condition. Thus, if a boy fails with a percentage of 35 in Virgil, and is able to pass in freshman Latin with a grade of A, B, or C, he satisfies the entrance condition and at the same time receives credit toward his college degree. Until the present year it was possible for a boy to remove an entrance condition in this manner although he had never attempted to pass the examination,

Obviously the adjustment between the college and the school is not perfect, but leniency on the part of the college does not improve the situation. The difficulty arises from the lack of clearness as to just what the entrance requirements actually denote. The catalogue statements represent them as indispensable. "A student who wishes to enter college must pass" such and such examinations for admission. It is not stated just why the particular requirements are set up as thus fundamental, but one of two theories is to be implied: the requirements embody an indispensable minimum of knowledge, or they represent an indispensable minimum of training. In other words, an ordinary boy, in order to have a good chance of success in

college, must either know the ground covered by the requirements, or he must at least have had the mental drill to be obtained through the mastery of the requirements.

In either event, the college is illogical when, after thus setting up its minimum, it proceeds freely to make exceptions to it. The records show that a large part of the incoming class has conditions, varying from one to five or six, and sometimes more. In the face of such administration, it is impossible to maintain that the entrance requirements are a real minimum; they are at best an ostensible minimum, any part of which is liable in most colleges to temporary suspension, and occasionally to complete abrogation.

It would seem that, to bring order out of this situation, it is necessary, first, to decide what the minimum is actually meant to accomplish, and second, what it must embody in order to achieve this purpose. So much being clear, it must be enforced as the *sine qua non*. Such a minimum would not be by itself the basis of college entrance, but an inevitable preliminary thereto. The student should unquestionably be required to do much more than this minimum before being admitted. In determining the content and extent of the additional studies, an entirely new set of considerations enters. The present arrangement fails to distinguish the general from the individual factor. In consequence, the entire situation is involved in confusion, the one sure result of which is to habituate young students to notions of promotion, despite superficiality and failure, now in this subject, now in that. The knowledge of every college candidate supplies him with a succession of instances of admission in which the stated stipulations are broken.

The special student is on a somewhat different basis. This provision is more in the nature of an equity proceeding, designed to supply a certain degree of elasticity to an otherwise rigid system of entrance examinations. It furnishes a way of meeting the needs of mature and serious persons who for one reason or another have not pursued the regular educational routine, and who, through extraordinary effort, have won a second chance; their seriousness of purpose, their maturity in development, amply compensate a technical deficiency in entrance units. No sensible person would propose to exclude from academic privilege the student who relatively late in life and after a sobering experience thus gains access to collegiate opportunities.

An analysis of the special student enrollment, however, discloses the fact that, instead of being limited to the use just indicated, the classification in question has likewise become a means of reducing or of evading entirely the entrance requirements. Unsuccessful candidates for admission urge and the college agrees that a system of entrance examinations does injustice to certain individuals temperamentally unsuited to display their acquisitions through written examinations. There is no doubt that this at times happens—though by no means usually in the cases in which it is alleged to have occurred. But in any event the remedy fails. Further, it is urged that through admission as special students college advantages may be extended to those who have had no access to adequate secondary schools. Whatever merit this contention may once have had, it has now lost most of its force. The enrollment of special students has increased, though the cogency of the argument has steadily diminished.

The terms in which college catalogues usually handle this subject are so vague that one is prepared to encounter great laxity and inconsistency in the actual administration. Harvard requires 16 units for entrance; but it admits as specials, without examination, students who are fit "to pursue the particular courses they elect." Out of 2,277 undergraduates there are 231 specials. The Johns Hopkins University requires 15 units for entrance; it admits with 8 units those "qualified by age, character, attainments, and habits or study." Out of 165 undergraduates, 23 are specials. The Department of Arts and Science of the University of Pennsylvania requires 14.5 units for entrance; but it admits specials on certificates covering requirements for desired courses only. Out of 299 students, 35 enter on these terms. Adelphi College requires 14.5 units; but it admits "specials" of mature age on "satisfactory evidence of proficiency," and in consequence it has 52 unclassified students out of a total of 170.

It is clear that vague descriptions such as I have quoted will not bar out unfit, undeserving, and incompetent applicants. If the regular procedure is in danger of being suspended in behalf of candidates who allege that they are mature and qualified, quoting the local clergyman and the family physician in support of the allegation, the college must create some effective machinery for intelligently and severely passing on such applications. A faculty committee, which for administrative purposes is liable to

reduce itself to a secretary, acting on a few written documents submitted by the candidate himself, can not avoid or effectively check abuse. In consequence, a measure designed to relieve mature workers of tests no longer important to them has become a back door for the admission of a miscellaneous collection of students of all ages and types, many of them boys of average age, who did not realize the clumsiness or difficulty of admission requirements until they themselves had failed to meet them.

The facts recited above are suggestive; they may indicate any one of several things. For instance, the desire for numbers being keen, lax provisions for the admission of special and of conditioned students may mean that a rigidly enforced entrance standard would threaten seriously to cut down enrollment, and that extraordinary measures have been devised to offset their effect. If this view is correct, the college has embarked upon a dangerous course which threatens its sincerity and its efficiency. Or, again, the facts may signify that there is no very close connection between fulfilled requirements and college performance; in which case it is held wise to admit deficient students of average age, or older, and to wipe out their deficiencies by some other method than through the entrance machinery. If this be true, it is time, not to make exceptions that confuse all standards and demoralize students, but seriously to face the problem of organizing preparatory education on a basis that is really vital and indispensable, and of devising machinery capable of enforcing it. It is bad pedagogical procedure to tell the prospective candidate that entrance to college involves a specific previous achievement, and then to familiarize him with the spectacle of frequent cases in which he learns that the terms have been partly or wholly waived. The ethical and scholarly standards would be higher if a less pretentious requirement were unflinchingly enforced.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

DR. NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.—Sometimes the best way out of a speech is to try to make it. I have listened with great interest to these discussions, especially to the last paper. It reminded me of what I heard in another State not long ago. They are having in that State an educational commission to revise the school laws, and I was talking to one of the leading educators, who said: "The commission has in its head only one idea, that of quantity. It has never thought of quality." A good deal of this discussion about rigid entrance conditions looks to me as though it were based entirely on quantity, without any reference to age and without any reference to quality. It is well known to those who are real teachers that sometimes a student who has graduated from the high school and who, perhaps, fails in his examination in Virgil, will, if he is given a chance in a college for ten weeks, show that he can do the work laid down; and, after all, in all promotions and in all admission to colleges the true test is not so many units passed at an examination, but ability to do the work that is laid down in the course. I am very glad that the western universities are giving young men—who perhaps find themselves late in life and enter a university at 24—I am glad that these western universities are giving such young men a chance.

In the Middle States we have more preparatory schools, but at least 40 per cent. of the children of Pennsylvania have no access to high schools; and when a college admits conditionally young people who have been taught to work on a farm as well as at school, and who when they are in the college show that they can do satisfactorily the work laid down in the course, the college is doing the individual and the nation good service. The college does not exist for a rigid system of standards, but the primary purpose of the college is education—service to humanity.

I fancy that I have studied the action of examinations about as much as the average man has studied them. I have to do with the licensing of dentists and of doctors, as well as of school teachers, and I found the other day that a young man had been kept from entering a State licensing examination because, according to the rating of one authority, he had but fifty-

eight units, whilst according to the rating of another authority he had sixty units; in other words, he was two units short; and how did he happen to be two units short? He had passed an examination in United States history, instead of American history, and when we went back over three years we found that American history in three years, under those examinations, had but three questions that would not fall under the head of United States history, and I asked, "In the name of all sound education, what difference does it make in the filling and care of teeth whether a person answered these few questions in the American history or not?"

Now, I am glad that in our rigid examination systems we are bringing to light the retardation of pupils, which is startling the country; but I am sorry that we are doing some things in the name of educational standards that are nothing but veritable nonsense. I plead for a chance for the student, and, Carnegie Foundation or no Carnegie Foundation, I praise the colleges that give the mature youth a chance to show that he can do the work laid down in the course of study.

MR. W. N. MARCY, *THE MACKENZIE SCHOOL*.—I had hoped that after Doctor Canfield had spoken today about English schools it would hardly be necessary for me to say anything. Probably my speech already betrays me, in spite of the fact that I have spent sixteen years as a teacher in this country. I was born and brought up and educated in England, in one of the schools Doctor Canfield was kind enough to mention as one of the great schools of England; that is, St. Paul's.

I spent eight years at St. Paul's School and three years at Cambridge University, and I regret that Doctor Canfield failed, as it seemed to me (if I may venture to criticise my elders), failed to bring out the one greatest feature of the English schools, the enormous momentum of the work that is done and the enormous amount of work that is done. The boys work from 9 o'clock a. m. until 1 p. m. without recess, and from 3 o'clock until 5 in the afternoon. Those are one-hour periods, and are all recitation periods. Such a thing as a period of study is unknown at St. Paul's School during the daytime. That means that the preparation for the next day's work must be done at night. I am not going to make a comparison.

We turn out men who, it seems to me, are healthy (I am not going to make comparisons), but who are able to stand that strain, if it is a strain, and to stand it for eight and nine years of preparatory school work; and I have always wondered why, if an English boy can work six hours for eight and nine years, why the American boy can not do the same; and I am afraid the answer is that the American parent won't let him.

I should be churlish if I ventured to contradict any of the statements that Doctor Canfield has made, and yet, from his own confession, he has found it hard to get into the life of the English schools; and so I feel sure he will pardon me if I call your attention to some facts that seem to me hardly accurate.

Before I pass to that there is one other point I should like to bring to your minds. Such a thing as stupidity in an English boy is not recognized. The English master does not recognize that a boy is stupid. He says, "This is the work to be done, and if you don't do it then I'll thrash you," and he thrashes him. Gentlemen and ladies, you will be surprised what a wonderful effect the end of a cane has in developing knowledge. I know very little of geometry, but all I do know I learned at the end of a stick. The point I am trying to bring out is this: In this country at least it is impossible to teach with the stick; but is it impossible for us to use other pressure, to bring other pressure to bear? My whole point is that the masters and mistresses in this country do not put their hearts and souls into it, and if they did a great deal more work could be done.

Now, if I may pass to some of the remarks that Doctor Canfield has made: I only venture to deal with those that seem to affect the crucial life of the English schools and the things of which I and other Englishmen are proud. If I have mistaken Doctor Canfield he will correct me. He has said that the English schools have only recently taken to sending their masters to important positions in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and I understood him to say, further, that there was but one full professor so taken from a private school. In my own school time, in the seven years I spent at St. Paul's, three St. Paul's masters were taken to Oxford and Cambridge University. One of them was made a full professor of Latin, one of them was made a university examiner, and one of them was made a full Greek professor. Those are three masters out of one school in the period of six or seven years that I can myself speak of.

Doctor Canfield has said that house-masters are perhaps in an unenviable position. If I may say so, the proudest man, I believe, in the English public school is the house-master. The house-master, aided (and this, again, is the secret of the great success of English schools) the house-master, aided by the sixth-form boys, who are the backbone of the whole house, has the entire moral charge of those boys, and lives their life from 6 in the morning until 6 at night. His whole being is wrapped up in the welfare and scholarship of those boys who are thrown in his charge. It is true that his living in some extent depends upon it; that for board and lodging he receives a certain stipend, but I never knew an English house-master into whose mind the question of money once entered; and furthermore, I never knew an English boy who ever said to himself, "I am paying \$900 and I am going to get \$900 worth."

There are other smaller matters that Doctor Canfield has spoken of, and that I haven't the time to bring up, and, as I say, I should feel churlish to bring up if I could, but if I could only—I have tried before today—if I could only impress on the teachers of this country that the fault is not with methods, but the fault is with the teachers of this country themselves, and I myself am one of them.

The Rhodes scholars are now at Oxford University. Last summer, when I was home, speaking to one of the Oxford examiners, I said, "What do you think of the Rhodes scholars?" He said, "I may say they are fine, bright fellows, but they are abominably trained." We think, in this country, that England, forsooth, knows nothing of methods. Again I have no comparisons to make.

PRESIDENT E. D. WARFIELD, LAFAYETTE COLLEGE.—There is one thing which occurs to me as worthy of a moment's attention in connection with the question of publishing in the catalogue the rule of the college with regard to entrance conditions.

Lafayette is one of the colleges that does not publish any such rule. One of the reasons why is that there is a body of students who will always take advantage of such publication and claim the right to be admitted with conditions, while we hold that there is no just reason why a student coming from a good school should be admitted with conditions.

There is another question which seems to me to be of importance from the college point of view. We hear a great deal today about the freedom of the professor, and the individual point of view is always, in my mind, a valuable asset. The attempt to reduce everything, as has been said by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to mere quantitative statements, the attempt to reduce everything to units or to precise regulations, takes away a great deal of personality. In our Faculty we have men who insist that conditions in their department shall be made up before the first of the next January. We have other professors who insist that no conditions in their departments shall be made up in the course of the first college year, as the student has enough to do to do his current work. The latter view particularly applies to purely preparatory subjects, which are supposed to strengthen the men generally, and not to be specifically demanded in the further pursuit of some college course. Thus, for example, there is no work in the freshman year which requires the immediate use of the requirement in history. Hence we ask that the student shall make up that work in the next summer vacation, and he is recommended to have regular instruction in that department. If all of the regulations as to conditions were published in the catalogue it would require almost another catalogue to contain them. This is one of the points with regard to which we should encourage in the college freedom of action and a study of the needs of each student.

I have very great sympathy with what Doctor Schaeffer has said, but I have long ago come to the conclusion that there is no room in the college for the special student. The co-operation which is necessary between the secondary school and the college in a community such as ours really demands that we should send the irregularly and the imperfectly prepared boy back to a good preparatory school. Not because of any hardship that we would lay upon the boy, but for the simple reason that what we are seeking is that every man should be taught to make the most of the opportunities that are being offered him by contemporary education, and that he should realize that though he can get into college and get along in college, perhaps even stand high in college because of his native ability, the year that he has lost out of the preparatory school—that last year in a good secondary school—is a loss that he can never repair. Many of us know

how serious is the loss that came to us when somehow we missed an opportunity in our early education that we have never been able to go back and repair.

Let me add one other word in connection with what has been said today. It was said this morning that we were losing the Latin prose composition. I hope that those who are teaching Latin will see to it that the teaching of Latin prose is not only not done away with, but that it is strengthened.

I had an unusual preparation in Latin, and I elected Latin through my own college course at Princeton. But when I went to Oxford it amazed me to see the way my contemporaries there could use Latin. Their knowledge of Latin prose and verse composition put them in a position to deal with any critical question of Latin translation that was far above my training. The significance of this lies in the fact that he who is thoroughly grounded in composition not only knows how to read Latin—knows what an author says—but he knows what he might have said; knows the distinction the writer intends to make. We all know that in English, in French and in German, in the teaching of all modern languages, the value of composition is coming to be more and more recognized. We shall not have capable Latin scholars until the preparatory schools send men to college thoroughly equipped in Latin prose composition.

THIRD SESSION

Friday, November 27, 8 P. M.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

THE ONE THING NEEDFUL.

PRESIDENT JAMES G. CROSWELL, THE BREARLEY SCHOOL.

The task of the teacher, be it in school or in college, is not an easy one. There are a set of unpleasantnesses peculiar to our profession, of which the most unpleasant is that, as a profession, we are subjected to more criticism, just and unjust, than any other trade, or profession has to endure. We school teachers are criticised by our pupils, by their parents, by the citizens of our republic, by all the newspapers, indeed by all those who think they can see a gap between their ideals of what we ought to do and our performance of our tasks. Like the ministers of the gospel, we are always under fire from those we would serve, and in some sense perhaps we always deserve it.

But, like no other profession, school and college teachers are also exposed continually to shots from the rear. Our profession suffers more from self-criticism than any other; more than in any other profession, except perhaps that of the artist, the humblest workers behold the glory of the ideal. We all see the hill-tops of our aspiration and we observe distinctly one another's distance therefrom. Teachers collected in convention suffer from special forms of depression, in addition to our chronic despondency. We exhibit a "conventional melancholy." It is brought on or much increased by such heart-searching exercises as we have had this afternoon.

The best of us, perhaps the best more than the worst of us, are prone to utter on these occasions somewhat despairing statements over the condition of the teaching world as it exists today. Just at present there seems to be an unusual abundance of such pessimistic views before the public. In Professor Barrett Wendell's last book, for example, entitled "The Privileged

Classes of America," I find these impressive sentences: "There are few colleges of America in which we are not often confronted with bachelors of arts who are virtually uneducated." Or this: "All over the world the traditional methods of education have been tried and found wanting." And here, again: "From my point of view, the younger generation seems hardly educated at all."

In the presidential address of last year President Woodrow Wilson made some statements of the same sort, viewing the matter from another angle. "I have had the experience (which I am sure is common to modern teachers) of feeling that I was bending all my efforts to do a thing which was not susceptible of being done, and that the teaching that I professed to do was as if done in a vacuum, as if done without a transmitting medium, as if done without an atmosphere in which the forces might be transmitted." Or this: "I wish to state these things, if need be, in an extravagant form, in order to have you realize that we are upon the eve of a period of reconstruction. I never attend any gathering of this kind (that is, a teachers' convention) that I do not hear the frankest admission that we are in search of the fundamental principles of the thing we are trying to do."

This view prevails with Mr. Abraham Flexner in his recent book on the American college. He speaks as follows: "Our college students are just as lacking in spontaneous and disinterested intellectual activity as in more strictly instrumental power and efficiency." Or this: "Our college students are and for the most part emerge flighty, superficial and immature, lacking, as a class, concentration, seriousness and thoroughness." The drift of his arguments, he thinks, establishes the proposition that the very qualities which seem to secure the degree B. A. would secure a man's dismissal from any other business whatever.

It is small wonder that, bearing the burden and heat of the day and getting so bad a harvest, school teachers should sometimes grow faint and weary. The prospect does at times look dark. I myself received a letter recently from a school teacher in New York, a teacher who had been successful in every way, having done, perhaps, the best work in the city and received much reward in the good will and affection of her scholars. She was writing on business, but her pen, straying to

the general discussion of the teacher's work and its reward, summed up her experiences as follows: "Sometimes, in the last few years, I have been made to feel, considering the tortures that are applied to me, that school teaching might be characterized as General Sherman described war."

I am here tonight to deny the validity of all such statements and all such criticisms, long and short, if considered as serious attempts to assess the total value of American educational work of today, though I am willing to accept them as suggestive propositions to open up our discussion of a topic I desire to introduce.

I do not believe we are going to destruction. I do believe, however, that "*Porro unum est necessarium*." With us, as with the young man in the Bible, there is something necessary to perfection which we do not now notably possess in the American school life. With all our endeavors and success there is something missing. I propose, as well as I can, to offer suggestions which may at once account for these animadversions of our critics and do something, on the other side, toward describing the better state of things I desire to see.

In the first place, there is a misunderstanding or two to clear up. School teaching is not heaven, either to the teacher or learner. We should not try to make our schools too blissful. The unsuccessful effort to make heavenly schools will account for a good deal of the melancholy and despair which at times settles over us. The simple fact, hard to remember as it seems, is this, that the world in which teachers live and scholars work is a curious world of itself, full of odd geography, but it is neither hell nor heaven. It is true, many of our experiences as teachers give a certain plausibility to my friend's saying that school teaching had some resemblance to the adventures of the Inferno, or at least we will confess that it suggests the classical Hades. I have often thought, as I read the sixth book of the *Æneid*, that Virgil must have foreseen school teaching. I know the wheel of Ixion; it suggests to me the routine in which I have spun round, Tuesday following Monday, Wednesday Tuesday, and so on for twenty years. Catiline has abused our patience longer than he did that of Cicero; Homer has, as the Greek epigram says, supported more lives than ever the Iliad made the prey of dogs and birds. I know the stone of Sisyphus, rolled

everlastingly up hill and everlastingly bounding down again. Has it ever happened to you to hear a pupil, after two years of algebra, inquire in a startled voice, "What is an 'unknown quantity?'" As for the banquets of Tantalus, we teachers have educational luxuries set forth by publishers of schoolbooks and makers of committee reports which evade our touch as we grasp after them in vain.

School is not heaven, but school differs profoundly from any circle of any inferno. The world of school is, beyond all worlds, the place of hope. However crude and imperfect our present arrangements, however crude our processes, however unsatisfactory our results, however deeply condemned may be the young men who take our degrees and diplomas, there is no sense in speaking in despair of the worst school that ever was known; there is always a possibility, nay, even a probability, of improvement. Hope is the great commodity of all schools. Anything may happen in a school; even the imps of the pit may in one hour become angels of light; not only become so, but remain so. A boy may turn into anything, even into a man. The worst, yes, the worst possible system of education turned in the worst possible way, by the worst possible hands, has on occasion transformed itself, slowly or suddenly, into a thing of greater and greater beauty.

But if school is not heaven nor hell, neither is it earth. The common blunder in judging the world of school and college is to presume to judge this fluctuating, adoleseing mass by the fixed standards of the adult world. Such is the blunder of the critics above quoted. Men judge schools, schoolboys and even schoolgirls by the standards of adult males. They do not recollect that our profession differs from all others in that its business is not transacted upon their earth at all. Our world may not be in heaven, but neither is it on *terra firma*. We live and work in the borderland, the "never, never land," the limbo of the innocents. There lies the "bonny road that winds across the ferny brae" of youth. The school world is full of hope, but it is not a land of attainment. School is a place of still unrealized ideals, of loyalties to the causes that can not be described as lost, because they have never been won. Why should we judge these half-defined cloud lands by the standards of any old man in this old world?

Such an answer I should make to most critics such as I have quoted. Such are the feelings with which the American, the school teacher or the schoolboy himself, is apt to answer all critics of his shortcomings. Even parents, in one of their two moods, are indulgent to these arguments. As Professor Briggs very keenly says, "Many parents regard school and college as far less serious in its demands than business; a place of delightful irresponsibility, where a youth may disport himself before he is condemned to hard labor."

Possibly, however, we Americans tolerate childishness too long and too much in school and college. We may let our children remain too long immature, under the influence of these feelings which I have described. Our critics may be right in this regard. American teachers are not awake to the actual danger of the situation. Let us consider the matter again more carefully.

After all, more does go to the making of man than quick senses or volatile attention or the hopefulness and charm of childhood. If we have no more than that in our schools we are not contributing our proper share to the maturing of the nation. To remind us of a better ideal, let me read to you President Wilson's description of the educated man as he gave it at Haverford this month: "The nation needs not only men in the vague and popular sense of that word, that is, men who have been taken from the narrow surroundings of somewhat simple homes and who have gone through the process of a sort of miniature world (what I have just called of the unreal world) such as the large college often is; it needs trained and disciplined men, men who know and who can think; men who can perceive and interpret, whose minds are accustomed to difficult tasks and questions, which can not be threaded except by minds used to processes and definite endeavor; men whose faculties are instruments of precision and whose judgments are steady by knowledge. Such men it is not getting by the present processes of college life, and can not get them until that life is organized in a different spirit and for a different purpose." These are beautiful words, and as we read them we can not but appreciate more deeply the complexity of what we ought to do for education. One may doubt and despair if one turns his eyes too earnestly on this dazzling standard. When we contrast the elaborate finish of this ideal product with the intellectual crudity of

the early stages of a boy's life, as we have them, few of us would venture to promise, by any process of our present schooling, to produce such beings as these. Very few such men get born, though such men do appear in the college world oftener than President Wilson will admit. He is such a man himself. He has, therefore, no right to say that such men are not produced at all by our educational processes. What we have to do, we will admit, is to consider more carefully the process of maturing and to improve it if we can. We must find better ways of helping the process of growth in making less the stupidities of youth. We now multiply the children's experiences of life, but we must also deepen them.

We must think with patience of this process and with hope of the result. We produce some good men now; we must produce more of them. Especially we must try to produce more mature men. It is our duty to advance the maturity of young Americans. Yet, on the other hand, in the interests of this maturity, I should say to our critics and to my colleagues, we must stay our haste and make delays. This part of the teacher's duty, to diminish the pace of life for young people, is least understood by American parents, and the American community is, therefore, impatient with us. Much of the school criticism arises simply from undue impatience. Delay in ripening is a very vital part of the ripening process. "Before the beginning of years there came to the making of man time, with the gift of tears." And yet we talk to parents, and college presidents talk to us, as if some teachers' association, some day, would invent a process to eliminate patience and time; as if children could be matured, if we only knew how, in no time at all, as in Paradise.

I recollect hearing once of a process for maturing wine "while you wait." The inventor had figured that contact with the air was the chemical cause of the ripening of wine. As contact could only occur at the surface, consequently, if any way could be found for multiplying the points of contact between the air and the surface of the liquid, the process must be shortened by that factor. His patent or device was to take the wine to the top of a shot tower and spray it downward through the air 400 feet, whereby raw, new port must become fine old wine in the space of about five minutes. Some of our schemes and systems for the economical ripening of youth seem to have the defects of this device, physically and psychologically.

All American life, American ideals, American practices need the slow ripening of time. We must therefore ripen our educational processes, maturing the culture of those who control and plan them. We need a patient attendance, too, on the natural growth of our children. Moreover, our critics need patience in their estimation of our results. A good friend of mine, who sent me into the teaching profession thirty years ago, gave me that watchword as the result of his own successful experience. "You will need patience every day," said he; "you will need courage once a month." I have needed more patience and less courage than that. We all of us have courage enough, especially in challenging the difficulties of our educational task; probably we none of us have patience enough with ourselves and our institutions.

But the unrest of our generation of which I speak is, as a sign of the times, not to be dismissed with a mere recommendation of patience. What does it mean, that for a generation, as Woodrow Wilson said to us last year, "we have been passing through a period when everything seems in the process of dissolution?" When there is such a universal dispersion of every ancient aspect and conception of our world we must examine ourselves. There must be a cause for it. If the new renaissance is due, and perhaps overdue, patience alone will not produce it.

We need something yet to satisfy the longings alike of the hopeful and the despairing who study the educational field. There must be something more looked for to save us. And this one thing needful seems to me to be a better attitude of mind toward work. If one looks more carefully into the mass of criticism of our processes of which I am speaking one feels that they generally reduce to mistrust of the attitude of mind toward work prevailing among teachers or students, or both. As President Wilson said, we are in search of fundamental principles of the thing we are trying to do, and we must be on the eve of a period of reconstruction. Now, there is nothing more fundamental than the attitude of mind with which scholars and teachers attack their common task. It is probably our attitude toward our work as scholars and teachers which we should reconstruct. A search for the best method of doing this ought to reward us, even before we capture any more fundamental principle.

An attitude of mind may determine not only the choice we

make among various ideals of work, but success and failure in reaching them. A new attitude of mind has before now brought about astonishing changes on the face of history. The crusades and all their vast consequences were brought about by an attitude of mind about the Holy Sepulcher. The beliefs and the hopes which accompanied them wrought out fundamental changes in Europe and Asia before they died away. The Reformation was, in the last analysis, a new attitude of mind in European Christianity. Renaissances always spring from intellectual changes, often in a comparatively small class of minds. The great philosophy of evolution which has transformed and is transforming the life of the twentieth century was created by a scientific attitude of mind working out its conclusions in a few laboratories and libraries.

In our own profession the introduction of the elective system was due to a change of mind among a few teachers. All the patient, vigorous work evolved in the establishment of the elective system in the educational institutions of this country during the last generation could never have been carried through had it not been based upon a significant change of mind among a few strong people. Certain people's beliefs about youth and the best experiences of youth in contact with work changed. That change of mind has changed the face of American schooling.

Now, what has happened once may happen again. What might happen if a change of mind as far-reaching as the belief in the elective system should occur again among school teachers? What a difference it would make in our schools and colleges if an attitude of mind should arise among boys toward work, among teachers and parents towards boys and the relation of work to workers, such as has already happened under our eyes in these few years. In what direction, then, shall we look for new forces which may bring about some fresh impulses in the mind of our scholastic youth?

Work, as work, is for some reason not sufficiently respected in American colleges and schools. There is a good deal of evidence that it is less respected in this country even than in the similar institutions in Europe. In the interests of the maturing process which I have said we ought to desire to hasten and increase in school we school teachers and parents should wish somehow to change the attitude of pupils toward their work.

Perhaps we should attempt to change the attitude of the teaching profession also, its present ideals and its present hopes.

Yet the impulse to the new life, the better attitude toward work, if it follows the analogies of other reforms, must probably come from outside the school and college world. Our minds may be subjectively prepared, but the fire must descend from elsewhere. It will not be any attitude of our own minds which we can ourselves create which will produce the new renaissance. Where shall we look for it, then? Whence will come the flash?

Not from our preoccupations with school and college administration. The new renaissance must not be mainly occupied with reforms and readjustments of the apparatus. We have been looking for reform for the last generation in technical improvement of educational processes. There is probably a real danger to us if we go on busying ourselves exclusively with educational machinery. We teachers are prone to think that if we get better apparatus on to the ground all reform is secured; as if, like a fire department, we had to extinguish a blaze instead of creating one. We rely too heavily on our paper schemes. The proverb says that hell is paved with good intentions. If this is ever true it is true of the educational Tartarus. Our hell is paved with school and college catalogues, with "requisitions" and "syllabuses" and other symbols of good intentions never carried out. High-minded idealists that we are, we still labor incessantly at the improvement and enrichment of our apparatus.

Schools are not made without ideals, and ideals can not be enforced without embodiment in personalities. The difficulty of getting great personalities into the teaching profession is undoubtedly one of the causes of exactly the immaturity which we are deploring, of the lack of spontaneous activity in the college classes. I quote Professor Wendell's book again, though I confess my quotations are taken at random and do not represent the main current of his remarks. Mr. Wendell speaks on one page of "personalities with too much vigor to remain content with school teaching." Again, he describes the teaching profession as made up of "scholars and lame ducks," "who keep themselves alive by teaching." If this opinion prevails in America about the teaching profession we can not rely on a great number of superior personalities joining us in our forlorn hope, cer-

tainly not enough to bring about a "New Renaissance," to get a new attitude of mind in the place of the old one by their inspiration. If we are to have among us teachers that produce scholars and lame ducks, the attitude of mind of pupils, teachers and parents to work will never improve.

But I am prepared to say that even if by some miracle a large number of authoritative personalities were to appear in the next generation of school teachers there would still be need of further help to produce the change of heart for which I am looking. There is something further needful than great ideals embodied by great teachers. The saying that Mark Hopkins at one end of the log and a student at the other makes a university is only in one sense true. There must be an atmosphere, an intention, an ambition on both sides of the log, which would hardly be created simply by a dominating personality. We want better reactions on the part of our students themselves, not a reaction excited merely by their interest in attractive people.

While we gladly welcome, therefore, the mystical transfer of life by the living to the living, which Thring described as the true definition of the teacher's activity, there lies even beyond this a more maturing experience still, which every boy and girl must have deep rooted in their lives if they are to be true men and women. Our students must know work.

The hunger for work which comes to every man when he first faces the life struggle, that lonely, competitive personal struggle which we must all know, I shall once for all describe as working for the market. That is the one thing needful to make our schools alive again. Our boys and girls, our young men and women must learn to work by working for the market. This market may be man's market, where one earns one's living, or God's market, where one earns one's salvation. It is this sacramental touch of the spirit of work upon our spirits which we ought to yearn for in the lives of our youth in our secondary schools and colleges. This touch is now, it seems to me, very much wanting. Our boys and girls do not believe they are working for any market at all. If we could persuade the boys and girls in our schools and colleges that they were truly earning their living at school by their work in school we should soon find that our American youth would rise nearer to the measure of their duty in the high schools and colleges. If it could be

seen by pupils that the processes and occupations in the high schools and colleges were in any way concerned with their own marketable value as men we should soon see a renaissance begin. Nothing short of this attitude of mind will really save our schools.

I dislike the words "cultural" and "vocational," but in this connection I feel much tempted to use them. And if I use them I should say that if we wish a new renaissance we must assess the value of our educational institutions in terms of vocation. All pursuits in school should be thought of by the students as vocational pursuits. This will renew our lives. The day one feels that his work is worth more than he is that day the boy becomes a man. I do not say that one must earn dollars or quarters of dollars, necessarily, to acquire that new feeling. When the storm of the Civil War swept over this country a most marvelous change was wrought in many an idle boy. The heroes whose names are inscribed on the walls of our institutions of learning are the names of boys often chiefly distinguished in college by their apathy in all matters of scholastic regimen. Why did they drill in the army who never would drill in college? It was because they saw that their output was marketable in one case and not in the other. It was cultural versus vocational activity. Many are the markets of the universe. They were earning their living who fell at Gettysburg; home they went, and took their wages.

I urge, then, greater consideration and greater esteem for the vocational ideal in school. I think this will work a great change of mind and a greater change of practice. Vocation alone can stimulate Americans to duty. We can not, of course, deny the value of self-culture as a good in itself, nor can we tell our children that anything they do at the age of the secondary school life will be marketable in any very definite vocation. Nothing that our pupils put out, whether it be the solution of a mathematical problem or the acquisition of French or Latin, is as marketable as they are themselves. But though this be the master fact of the adolescent situation, it is not in the least wholesome for such an idea to dominate their imaginations. Cardinal Newman, I believe, laid down the ingenious paradox of ethics, as follows: "Be virtuous and you will be happy. But they that seek happiness have not the virtue." Let me alter it. "Be industrious in school and you will be cultivated. But they that work for

culture never have the right kind of industry. It is only those who work for the product's sake who truly work."

I propose, then, that we should cease to emphasize the cultural ideal of work, as we have done in the past in school and college, and should emphasize the vocational. Culture is not a wholesome ideal for youth. It is in no way a natural ideal for youth; least of all is it so in our generation. Any boy or any girl in our time must work for some social market; the nearer the market the better. It is, for example, because the playing of a football game seems to boys a true vocation that athletics have flourished so largely in the midst of the cultural vacuum, into which Woodrow Wilson describes our teaching as having passed. Can any one conceive, for example, of the hosts which assemble to behold our boys following their "vocation" as athletes assembled to watch cultural exercises in gymnastics. It is the market of competition which enlivens the work of the muscles. Why not of the mind?

Let me repeat. I think that the cultural ideals of the past are not deeply rooted enough in the social life of the present and future to serve the turn of enlisting the best work of American youth. The educational ideal of Athens, for example, on which our ideals of culture generally rest, contemplated an aristocracy whose perfections, mental and bodily, rested upon slave labor and a social ideal of life now outworn. It fails to interest the modern world; our boys misunderstand it. Perfection of the Oxford culture, defined as Professor Jowett described it, teaching "the English gentleman to be an English gentleman," this, too, fails to meet the demand of our time in our country. "A gentleman's mark is 'C,'" was the immortal statement of an ingenuous college youth at Harvard. Why not? But no boy would ever believe that a "C" algebra, offered in any market, was worth more than an "A1" algebra.

In what way can we bring the more wholesome market ideal more closely before the eyes of growing boys and growing girls? In what way can we make the new technical studies serve the test of humanistic ideals, the ideals of work? For this is far more necessary than the reverse. In two ways, it seems to me.

The true market of adult life can be suggested in the work of the earlier years by increasing the number of vocational studies and vocational schools in our community. Let us have trades

taught universally. Let us, even in childhood, learn things which we know even in childhood can be taken to market. Open the trade schools, if we are to have them, to all comers. From them will spread precisely that seriousness about the process, that value in the product, which I desire to see increase in the life of American schoolboys. This will uplift our cultural ideals. Taking the market as it is, even with all its narrowness, let us see that our children get into it earlier than they now do. Let them learn to work with their hands, even though it were hunting and fishing. All the yachting and canoeing and boat-sailing, all the gardening and farming, into which hungry children throw themselves with such avidity, will increase and multiply the centers by which this vivacious ideal of the meaning of work, the true, new attitude of mind may spread.

A second way in which this same end may be reached seems to me important for us American school teachers to consider. Should we not multiply trainings for new vocations in our schools? Why must we narrow our vocational schools to the teaching of trades already at work in the market? Because they see no direct connection between school work and any definitely established trade or profession parents forget that their sons may be called upon to be pioneers in new vocations. We forget that America has to establish new trades and new professions as well as pursue the old ones, and that trade schools alone will not train a man even for the life of trade and commerce. In this connection I should be glad to tell you a story told me by Frederick Law Olmsted of his own beginning and his own experience. He it was who designed and mapped out Central Park, in New York. He told me that when this undertaking first began to be realized he was forced to spend nearly the whole of his days in persuading citizens and officials of New York that they needed a park there. His nights he gave to the professional work involved in making it. So in our work we must cultivate the demand for ourselves as a condition preceding our efforts to satisfy them.

Another thing we can do, if we wish to produce a more inspired industry in our secondary schools, is a thing which is close at hand. We might try to give more of their proper vocational values to such studies as actually exist in the present high school curriculum. We treat all our studies in the high

school and college too often with no regard to their vocational possibilities. We treat them as cultural subjects exclusively and they droop. But all the cultural subjects in our curriculum began originally as vocations. Vocations are older than cultures. Any culture study has more to gain from being true as a vocational study than it has to lose. For instance, it was not until Latin ceased to be of marketable value as a language that it posed as pure culture. But by treating it merely as a culture we are killing it off. Let us now treat it again as vocation. Mr. Wendell suggested that he studied Latin simply as a nauseous means of cultivating the voluntary attention. But why not learn Latin? Why not pursue it as a thing of vocational meaning? It can be done; it ought to be done. It is a language, after all.

Or why not learn some French in our schools? The new method of teaching modern languages has just the vocational meaning. Under the cultural methods of treating the subject one is supposed to value the intellectual culture involved in studying French grammar, rhetoric and literature more than he values the incidental French he acquires. Suppose one postpones all this to the acquisition of a working knowledge of French or German as languages. Would not the attitude of mind in our modern language classes improve? Are they not languages, after all?

Or consider mathematics. Why make that very practical subject so essentially into a setting-up drill of the intellect? Is it necessary to have three years of arithmetical culture, two years of algebraic culture, one year of geometric culture, all separated by logical classification from each other? Is there any good argument for this arrangement? Is there any vocation known in which geometry exists simply as an exercise in logic, independently of arithmetic or algebra?

Or consider the problem of instruction in English. Where would the cultural ideal conduct us finally if we pursued it in the study of English to the exclusion of vocational English entirely? Shall we be able to speak English? We have not made or we have lost too far the vocational connections in our school work.

When I plead for the vocational ideal as a new means of inspiration in our American schools, I am not speaking, of course, solely of the money value of acquisitions or talents. Money values may easily be overestimated, though money value is a pretty faith-

ful index of market value. A boy or girl who receives wages for work feels most vigorously, most strongly, that he is at last enlisted with the colors. It is a great experience, one that I should like every boy and every girl in our country to have, to work for money, as regularly as all European boys serve in the army, if only for two or three years.

But it need not be money values that we propose to consider when we speak of vocational work in school. Much social service is done, and always will be done, which can not be paid for in money. It is sufficient that a boy's work is recognized by the worker and his comrades as service. It may be service to the school, the college, the family, or the community. Work done in the sight of the host has its uplifting inspiration. Why not idealize the word "vocation" and make it appeal in more general ways to our scholars?

If our schools create this vocational atmosphere even in culture studies, great improvements must follow. Two of our greatest problems would probably be solved at once. Under no vocational ideal of school instruction could the absurd proposition maintain itself that every child, in every public school, must study every subject. This superstition sprang out of the old ideal of a rounded culture as the end of school work. This is already a hopeless ideal; it never had any vocational meaning.

Moreover, the other enemy of good work might vanish. If it were understood that the value of the product was to be considered, which each child can present to the world at the close of his school life, we should hear less of overcrowded high schools and overburdened taxpayers. Pupils who could not "make good" from the vocational point of view in pursuing their college and high school subjects, who could not produce any marketable commodity in any subject of learning, necessarily would receive no consideration from the taxpayers. Our democratic indulgence to incompetency in our public schools would be cut at the root.

These random suggestions seem to me to point out the road on which we may march; they do not pretend to be a developed scheme for immediate realization.

We need a new attitude of mind. I think we must search for the new attitude of mind by making our school and college work appeal more and more to the constructive ambition of American youth. James Russell Lowell was fond of saying that school

and college should be the place where "nothing useful was studied." He put it somewhere in another way, that we should respect and provide for the growing of roses, not less than cabbages, in our academic field. No one will deny the deep meaning of these poetic imaginations. Our new attitude of mind can not controvert them; but both roses and cabbages, after all, grow best when grown for the market. I confess, for one, that I think there is more danger in idly contemplating our cabbage field than in attempting to make roses useful. We must interest our boys more in the market values of their intellectual product. This is good modern pragmatism.

We must judge the schools with more severity from the standpoint of public market. Things are tolerated good-naturedly in American schools which would not be tolerated in Europe, where market values are more considered. We are too gentle, for example, with bad English if produced in school by a nice boy. The one thing needful is a new and severer attitude of mind, which would arrive automatically among both pupils and teachers if vocational ideals should be more considered, even at the expense of the cultural atmosphere.

As this convention is now housed in a church, I hope it will be permitted me to remind my audience of the New Testament story from which we have derived our phrase, "The one thing needful." The rich young man asked the Master what he must do to be saved. He rehearsed his great possessions and detailed his culture. But the answer was, "Sell all that thou hast." Does this not mean to take all that we have to market? This application of the parable is not fanciful, I think. It is good Christianity. Here shortly follows another parable which proves this. At the Day of Judgment, we are told, one set of mankind will appear before the bar of heaven, appealing to their cultural experiences. "Lord, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets." They have been in the presence of great things and great men; they have seen them idly; they have passed by. We are also told that they will be judged by a vocational test: Have they done anything "for the least of these my brethren?" And those who have only eaten and drunk in the presence of the Lord, who have never brought their talents to the market test, will be invited to depart with the other children of selfish culture to the place where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Vocation is a word to conjure with in modern America. I want to use it, with its associations, to cover the whole ground of a boy's experience in his school life. I want it to bring about a new attitude in work. Do not mistake me. I have no desire to make radical substitutions, say of laundry work for Latin. I do not wish the higher experiences of the soul to give way to the lower. But high or low are dangerous words to use of human education. Let the rose follow the vocation of the rose, and the cabbage of the cabbage; they are both in honor. Good laundry work well done is higher than bad Latin. Even for the cultural studies one may desire to win the connotations of the word vocational. There is no telling by what lowly door the Lord of Life may enter in.

Let us persuade our students to take their talents and their culture always in the spirit of service. Let us so teach them how to work and why to work and what work is, from the market point of view. That is the one thing needful, I think, to fill again the idle sails of American schools and colleges.

FOURTH SESSION

Saturday, November 28, at 10 A. M.

THE PRESIDENT.—The first business on the program is the Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board, of which Professor Edwin S. Crawley, of the University of Pennsylvania, is Chairman.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE ENTRANCE CERTIFICATE BOARD.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

To the President and Members of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

Ladies and Gentlemen.—The question of the establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board for the Middle States and Maryland first came before this Association at the meeting in 1906 in the form of a recommendation from the Williamstown Conference of the summer before. A committee was then appointed to look into the matter and to report at the next meeting. This committee made a report in 1907, recommending the formation of such a board. A new committee was then appointed to carry out this recommendation, and it is the report of that committee which I present.

The committee of 1906 had made inquiry of all the colleges and schools having membership in the Association as to their attitude toward the formation of a College Entrance Certificate Board, and had found that a very large majority favored it. The present committee issued a call for a meeting to all the colleges in the Association, and to the five secondary school delegates who had been appointed by the President of the Association, to be held in Philadelphia May 9, 1908. This meeting was attended by delegates from the following colleges:

Adelphi College,
Albright College,
Colgate University,
Cornell University,

Delaware College,
Dickinson College,
Franklin and Marshall College,
Haverford College,

Hobart College,	Union College,
Johns Hopkins University,	University of Pennsylvania,
Lehigh University,	University of Rochester,
Pennsylvania State College,	Vassar College,
Rutgers College,	Washington & Jefferson College,
St. John's College,	George Washington University,
St. Stephen's College,	Wells College,
Temple College,	

and by Messrs. W. W. Birdsall and James M. Green, of the secondary school delegates.

President Rhees, University of Rochester, occupied the chair.

This conference held two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. A constitution was drawn up and adopted tentatively, and the meeting adjourned without day, after appointing a committee of seven, who were charged with the duty of drawing up a set of rules of procedure for the proposed board, and of calling another meeting early in the present autumn. This committee of seven held a meeting on June 6, at which a set of rules was formulated. The constitution and rules were printed and copies sent to all who participated in the conference of May 9, to the other colleges which had expressed interest in the matter but had not been represented at the meeting, and to the three secondary school delegates who had not been able to attend.

Under date of September 30, the same committee sent out a call for a meeting in Philadelphia on November 14. The meeting was attended by delegates from the following colleges:

Colgate University,	St. John's College,
Cornell University,	St. Stephen's College,
Dickinson College,	Swarthmore College,
Hobart College,	Temple College,
Johns Hopkins University,	Union College,
Lehigh University,	University of Pennsylvania,
Muhlenberg College,	University of Rochester,
New York University,	Vassar College,
Pennsylvania College,	George Washington University,
Pennsylvania State College,	Wells College,
Rutgers College,	Woman's College, Baltimore,

and by Mr. Gunnison, of the secondary school delegates.

Chancellor McCracken, New York University, occupied the chair.

The constitution previously adopted and the rules which the committee had drawn up were considered in detail and revised in some respects. A copy of the constitution and rules as adopted by the conference of November 14 is submitted as a part of this report. Before adjournment the conference passed a resolution referring the revised constitution and rules back to the colleges, with the understanding that as soon as they shall have been ratified by not less than fifteen (15) colleges another meeting will be called and the board regularly organized. A committee of three was appointed with authority to call this meeting as soon as the necessary number of ratifications shall have been received. As this report shows, further procedure toward the definite establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board is now in the hands of the colleges concerned. Your committee would conclude its work, therefore, by recommending that the President of this Association appoint at once six secondary school principals to serve on the board, three to serve for one year and three for two years. By making these appointments now there need be no delay on this account in putting the business of the board into operation as soon as the required number of colleges have ratified the constitution and rules.

THE PRESIDENT.—You have heard the report of the committee. It lies before the meeting for discussion. General discussion on the report of the committee which has reported the establishment of the College Entrance Certificate Board is now in order.

PRESIDENT FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.—I move that the report be adopted.

Mr. W. N. Marcy seconded the motion.

THE PRESIDENT.—It is moved and seconded that the report of our committee presented by Professor Crawley on the establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board be adopted by this Association. As many as are in favor of the adoption of this report as given please say "Aye;" contrary minded, "No." It is a unanimous vote. The report of the committee is adopted.

I think, before passing to the next subject, as this is not only

a business meeting, but also a meeting for the informal exchange of ideas, I will ask if any one has any questions to ask of Professor Crawley, of an informal character, on the report, or on the meeting which has sent in this report, or on the general subject. Last year there was a good deal of general discussion on the merits of the question; but it was decided last year (I think properly) that we had to go forward—that the committee must be appointed (and it was appointed) for the establishment of this certificate board. I felt, however, at the time—and I dare say some of you felt—that we were not very well informed yet as to what the committee propose to do—what action, if any, they propose to take. This seems to be an opportunity, now, for any questions that may occur.

PROFESSOR THOMAS S. FISKE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I have been away for some time and have lost track, to some extent, of the details of the scheme; but on page 5 of this circular, Rule 7, I read: "All schools unconditionally approved shall continue on this list indefinitely," which will result in their being no necessity of renewal of application for approval. I should like to inquire whether this rule is similar to a rule adopted by the New England Certificate Board, or whether this is peculiar to the proposed board of the Middle States and Maryland.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—The rule of the New England board is, that no school remains automatically on the approved list for more than three years. At the end of the period of three years the school must itself renew its application. Our committee thought that so long as a school's record is satisfactory, as shown by the standing maintained by the students whom it sends to college upon certificate, it is useless to go through the form of removing it from the list periodically and then reinstating it. The board will make, every three years, however, specific inquiries of each school on the list, similar to those made at the time of its application for approval.

PROFESSOR THOMAS S. FISKE.—Then there is a difference, in that the New England school must every three years demonstrate its eligibility to remain in membership; whereas, the Middle States school will continue indefinitely, unless its condition shall have

become notorious, we may say, and it shall have been expelled. In one case the school must be expelled, and then perhaps at some later period it can be readmitted; but in New England the school must demonstrate every three years that it is in good standing, in the same way as when it was first admitted.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH, MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL.—I would like to ask the chairman of this committee if the committee's plan comprehends at all any systematic visiting or inspection of the schools that are on the approved list by officers or instructors in the different colleges represented.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—That was a question which the committee and the conference both considered at considerable length, and decided that it was impracticable to institute, at present at any rate, any regular system of inspection; that the judgment as to each school will have to depend largely upon the records made in college by the students sent to college upon certificate from the school.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH.—Do I understand that the committee feels that such a system of inspection is impracticable?

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—Yes, principally on account of the great expense that would necessarily be involved.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH.—On page 4, division (e), "The general 'tone' of the school, so far as it may be possible to determine it." It certainly is a matter of importance to the board to know what the character and general tone of a school may be. How was that to be ascertained? Simply through the statement of the principal?

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—The point made by the previous speaker is the one that prompted some of the members at the meeting last year to evince some opposition to the creation of this College Certificate Board by the Middle States Association. It did seem to some of us that the vital point was to get an insight into the working of the school—not such an insight as appears from the incidental performance of a

few students at college, but a fuller view of a school in operation. And it seems to me that that objection has not been removed by the method of procedure indicated here. But in addition to that, it is fair to ask the question—Has the committee in any way determined definitely how it proposes to consider those several points on page 4: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f)? We hear that they are going to give consideration to those points; what degree of consideration? How is that to be measured? Courses of study maintained; character and equipment and efficiency in the teaching staff; and proportion of teachers? Has a norm been established, or is it a matter to be left, in each individual case, to the judgment of the board, which undoubtedly will be exercised with great conscientiousness? On the other hand, whether it would not be well to fix, definitely, standards, and have every school know that it must live up to those standards, otherwise it is likely to be found short of the requirement? If those are matters to be determined individually and incidentally, they may change from year to year; three secondary school men (that is, half of those appointed) will change; the representatives of the colleges will change from year to year; and a very stringent exercise of supervision in one year may be followed in succeeding years by a lax supervision.

If I understand this movement correctly, it is to enforce thorough work; to help in building up the secondary school work—the grades in the secondary school work. Unless some definite plan has been conceived by the committee, which does not appear in these statements, it is not likely that that will be secured and guarded very uniformly from year to year.

PRESIDENT THOMAS FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.—Having been one of those who attended the various conferences, I may say that most of the questions that have just been raised were brought before our attention and discussed on those occasions.

It appeared to the Conference Committee that it was impossible to lay down any definite course of action for the Certificate Board.

By referring to paragraph III, on page 2 of the constitution, it will be seen that the date when the rules become operative has been postponed until September, 1911, as it was believed that in the interim the Executive Committee would be able to get to-

gether and develop the plans of procedure, in accordance with the experience they might have gained. That then they would have something of a definite character to submit for our consideration.

It seems to me that if any of the small colleges, governed as they are by local conditions, were to enroll themselves as members of the board, they would have to do so tentatively, with the understanding that if the conditions as mapped out eventually by the committee of the board are not satisfactory to them, they would be at liberty to withdraw.

I think, therefore, it is not within the scope of this Association to attempt to outline any course of action until the committee of the Certificate Board has had some practical experience and laid before us the definite plans which it advises us to adopt.

THE PRESIDENT.—As far as I am responsible for this discussion, I do not understand that this Association has the power or the wish now to accept or refuse this constitution, which is a constitution made by the Certificate Board itself. We are engaged, as I understand it, only in an informal discussion for the benefit of Professor Crawley and other members of the committee who are here. The committee's work is as yet not fully complete, and therefore I shall be very glad to hear everybody's recommendations on this floor. It will be duly passed over to the board and be entertained by them.

In answer to Dr. Fell, I have heard nothing to indicate that any college will not be free to retire in 1911 from participation in the benefits of this Certificate Board. It would be very absurd for us to try to bind colleges which refuse to belong to the Association.

We are all within earshot of the President, the committee has reported to this body that the board is to be established under this constitution, and the board will actually settle all the questions we are now discussing. Meanwhile we are merely questioning the future doings of the board.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR., RUTGERS COLLEGE.—It seems to me that an informal discussion of this kind is of the utmost importance, because, necessarily, much in the policy of the board, when established, has been as yet left undetermined. The committee

of which Professor Crawley is chairman has endeavored to outline a constitution and a few simple rules that seem capable of practical working, leaving the details largely to be determined by the board itself, when it shall be constituted, and by its Executive Committee, when that shall have been chosen. Two or three points have been raised which the committee has considered, and to which Professor Crawley has briefly replied. Perhaps a word might be added: In regard to the automatic dropping of a school no word has been said. In regard to the periodic examination of the actual conditions which exist in any school no word has perhaps been adequately said. The fact that every school's record is in a sense to be tested each year should, of course, be emphasized. Now, inasmuch as this constitution requires from all the participating colleges a report at the end of the first unit of college work (a term or a semester) of the record of all the students received by certificate, there is a sort of check at once. There is, besides that, the provision that the failure to use the privilege of certification automatically drops a school from the approved list. The fundamental matter, the matter about which debate may properly rage, is the question of how the certificate list is to be in the first place determined, and in the second place revised from year to year.

Two plans are possible. The one is the plan of depending upon written reports received from the schools stating, from their own viewpoint, what they are doing, what they can do, and what they propose to do, what courses, entrance requirements, and what teaching staff they have, what are the qualifications of the teaching staff, what apparatus is provided, what the tone of the school is. Appropriate blanks for securing this information Professor Crawley has, no doubt, in his mind and could draw in diagram if there were a blackboard here. When these claims are tested by reports from the receiving colleges, we have the elements of one plan. That puts the onus squarely upon results as shown in the first months of the college course; and a school will maintain its place, or lose its place, according to the record of the students entering by certificate into the participating colleges.

Another plan, which has its advocates, is in practice in the West, but not in the East, *i. e.*, an elaborate scheme of inspection of the schools demanding a place upon the approved list.

Now, we all know that a school is to be tested finally by the results seen in its actual operation; but any who have given thought to it, and certainly any who have had practice in school inspection, know that the force of inspectors requisite to do this work in the territory of the Middle States and Maryland, in a way that would be helpful, would have to be very large. I scarcely like to mention numbers. I am afraid it would seem extravagant if I told you what I really think. It would certainly be so large a force as to be utterly out of the question, in the judgment of the committee, at the present time. Moreover, it is the duty of the States in this territory themselves to do this work for the public high schools. It is already attempted in several of these States, and will be done with increasing thoroughness. And it seemed to the committee that the only practical way to start the Certificate Board would be frankly to adopt the basis of the New England Board in spite of its obvious limitations.

One fact is apparent to us all. If fifteen or more colleges in the Middle States and Maryland decide to come together and form this board, their co-operation will certainly be a valuable educational advance, even if it does not solve the problems that we have before us. It will be a contribution toward a better regulation of this certificating privilege, which has, in some cases in the past, amounted to an abuse.

PROFESSOR A. E. GOBBLE, ALBRIGHT COLLEGE.—There is another question with reference to the preparatory schools, and what was just said brought it into my mind. The preparatory school from which I had the honor to enter Franklin and Marshall College would probably not make much of a show if the professors of Columbia or the University of Pennsylvania would look over the list of questions that that little academy could answer, as far as equipment, etc., is concerned; and yet I know that there is not a college in the central part of Pennsylvania that would ever think of refusing to accept on its papers, I believe, students prepared for college at Professor Hosterman's school at Spring Mills. I know they have entered most of the colleges of Central Pennsylvania, and that little academy stands well in the eyes of the people who know it; but if you want to put the standing of that school on paper in cold figures that can be looked at with respect, so that it may be received into the list of

schools certifying to pupils for entrance into the colleges from a university standpoint, I don't think it would stand a chance at all. But as chairman of that committee in the college to which I belong, I should say at once, if a certificate would come from my old chum: "Let him come in." I would not want to turn any of his boys down, because I know that if he prepared any of his boys for college, they are well prepared; and yet that is a little institution. It is an academy during the summer months, and during the winter months it is a grammar school. We would not like to say that we would accept the certificate from a grammar school unless we knew the work of it; but you can not judge the working of it as you would a school with a hundred thousand dollars endowment back of it—or if you put a lot of apparatus into it. The boys coming from schools of the smaller kind, schools whose working we know because we are acquainted with the men who teach there, we have known before they came to those schools to prepare for college. Many times we have known those boys for years and known just exactly what they were doing from year to year before they made application; and for that reason we would like to get such schools as that on the list, although, as far as cold figures are concerned, I don't suppose they would be received.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR.—Pardon me if I add one word more which the discussion seems to render necessary. The territory over which this board is to have its eye in the selection of schools is very diverse in the condition of secondary education; and it is quite possible that a number of colleges are situated so that they ought not to become members of such a board at the present time. Where the secondary school system, particularly the public secondary school system, is still undeveloped, where free opportunity to attend a well-equipped secondary school is not within the reach of every boy, it scarcely seems to me possible for an institution to join this Board at the present time. There is a profound truth in the words of the last speaker, as I am sure all practical educators must know that some of the very best material that comes to the college is material irregularly prepared in schools where the personal quality of the headmaster or of some one teacher dominates the entire school life. We

have all seen such cases. This board, however, is to be a voluntary association of those institutions whose circumstances and surroundings do allow co-operation in this way. It is of importance to both college and secondary school, because it will tend to bring about a better development of secondary education where it is still in a chaotic and undeveloped state.

PROFESSOR ROBERT B. ENGLISH, WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.—In view of what has just been said, we are very anxious to determine, for our own enlightenment, what the position of a college like ours would be in the proposed plan of the Certificate Board. Washington and Jefferson, as you know, is located in the southwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania. A large percentage of our students come from Eastern Ohio, from Western Pennsylvania, and from West Virginia. And it must be said that some of the preparatory schools in this section are among the best that are to be found anywhere and some of them are not. In the matter of admitting students to college we have a complicated situation to meet. Our present plan is to admit tentatively by certificate from all the schools covering the work which we require for admission; but this is a temporary admission only. The certificate is interpreted to be presumptive evidence that the student is prepared for college. At the expiration of six weeks, every candidate is examined thoroughly in every department on the work which he has done in the college during these six weeks. It then remains in our judgment whether he is qualified to carry the work or not. If, in our judgment, he is not qualified to carry the work, he is remanded to the preparatory school. If he is qualified we take him in and give him all the aid we can. Our system, as you see, is a combination of two: it admits by certificate and by examination; the examination is not, however, on preparatory work, but it is on the work done in the college after the boy has been tentatively admitted. In becoming identified with this Board we would not like to surrender this method of admitting students, because we have found that it is a very satisfactory method. I would like to ask for information what, in the judgment of the chairman of the committee, our position would be relative to the proposed plan of the board.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—That is a difficult question to answer. I should think that perhaps you might save yourself the trouble of the six weeks' drill and move your examination up to the beginning of the year in the case of doubtful candidates.

PROFESSOR R. B. ENGLISH.—Our present method has resulted from the differences in the location and the differences in the quality of the schools sending students to us. To examine all prospective freshmen at the opening of the year, or at the commencement week of the previous year, did not seem to us satisfactory. It was tried for some years. I regret that Dr. Moffat could not be present at this session to represent the college, but I have conferred with him frequently on this subject, and I am sure that at Washington and Jefferson we all feel that the system we have adopted is the most satisfactory system we can at present formulate for that part of the country. We are anxious to co-operate for the benefit of all the schools sending students to the college, and we do not want to take any step that would forestall our object, or that would put us in a position where we could not accomplish what we want to do. I am frank to state what I have said because we are thoroughly in sympathy with the movement represented by this board.

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY.—I should like to ask whether the position of Washington and Jefferson is not that, practically, of every college that admits on certificate. They all admit, or pretend to admit, every student coming in on certificate, on probation, and profess to drop him at once—that is, in six weeks or three months—if he does not maintain his position. It would seem to me that on that basis Washington and Jefferson was distinctly a certificate-admitting college.

PROFESSOR R. B. ENGLISH.—I think we differ from many institutions in that we examine all candidates for the freshman class and only such candidates at the expiration of six weeks. All students in all classes are examined at the end of each semester. If a student fails in any part of his work at the semestral examination he must satisfy the requirements of the institution respecting such failure in order to maintain his position. But our sole aim and purpose in holding the examination at the end of six

weeks is to determine whether the candidate can continue a course in college or must spend more time in securing a better preparation. It has been our common experience that these men on probation do quite as good work in the first six weeks as any students are doing at the same time anywhere in the institution.

THE PRESIDENT.—Ladies and Gentlemen, these are matters of great general interest, and, I suppose, will be conveyed to the board by your delegates who are to be appointed. Are there any further hints or suggestions or expressions of feeling or definite proposals that anybody in this meeting would like to convey to the College Entrance Certificate Board, when established, in which this Association takes a certain part?

The morning is passing, and we have another interesting subject, the "Report of the Committee of Twelve on the Quantity of College Entrance Examinations." The report is to be presented by Headmaster Wilson Farrand, of Newark Academy. I will ask Mr. Farrand to please come forward and read it.

COMMITTEE ON QUANTITY OF COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.

PRESENTED BY HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY.

Your committee, composed of six college officers and six representatives of schools, appointed at the last meeting to consider the whole question of the quantity of college entrance requirements, begs leave to report as follows:

We have met and have discussed the subject as thoroughly as the time at our disposal would allow. We have found the subject a broad one, involving much detail and many points that call for careful investigation before an authoritative judgment can be pronounced on them. Some of these, as, for example, the question as to what should constitute a point or unit, and the whole question of the establishment of a scale of values for the measurement of entrance requirements, are at present under consideration by other bodies, and definite reports on them may be expected in the near future. We confine our report to the statement of a few definite principles on which our opinion is unanimous, and which we regard as thoroughly established.

As a preliminary statement we wish to say emphatically that in our judgment *the only ground on which a reduction of the quantity of college entrance requirements can justly be urged is that of an improvement in the quality of the work done in preparation for them.* The excessive amount of time and attention given by secondary school students of late years to athletics, fraternities, and social life is a distinct interference with efficient school work, and we do not believe that this is a valid reason for lightening the pupils' labors. It is a fact, however, that the ground to be covered in preparation for college has been greatly extended during recent years, until we have reached a condition where the work is not being satisfactorily accomplished; in other words, the increase in quantity has involved a sacrifice of quality. The standpoint from which we have viewed the question is not that of seeking to lighten the pupils' labors, but of striving to improve the quality of the work done. The question to be answered is whether the quantity of college entrance requirements has become too great to be covered properly in the schools. We

do not at this time attempt a final or complete answer to the question. We leave many topics for future consideration, such, for example, as the fourteen-point standard and related questions, and we express opinions only on points which we have carefully considered, and in regard to which there is no doubt in our minds.

1. The first principle that we wish to assert is that the amount of work that may reasonably be demanded for admission to college is measured by what can be done in an efficient four-year high school course, following an elementary school course of (say) eight years. This is not to assert that the ideal plan is that of a four-year high school course. The plan of a five or six-year course, such as exists in some private schools and is urged by high authorities as desirable for our public school system, appears to possess some distinct advantages. The four-year course, however, is the standard at present, and any increase in college requirements beyond what can be accomplished in these schools must mean either the confining of college preparation to a separate class of fitting schools, or the covering of the necessary ground in the regular schools in a superficial and unsatisfactory manner. Neither result is to be desired. We believe that the question of beginning the high school course earlier should be most carefully considered, and we have no doubt that if the plan proves feasible it will lighten the pressure that now exists in college preparation and at the same time will improve the quality of the work done. But even if such a plan were at once put in force it would be five or six years before it produced results, and we are concerned with the present situation. As things stand now, any demands on the part of the colleges that are in excess of what can be accomplished in good and efficient high schools must lead either to a breach between the schools and the colleges or to superficial work in college preparation, and are, therefore, to be deplored.

2. In the second place, we call attention to the fact that the number of subjects required for admission to college has been steadily increased during the last forty years. Then the requirements consisted of Latin, Greek, and a small amount of mathematics. Since then not only has the number of subjects called for in most of our colleges been increased, but also the ground to be covered. As instances, we may mention the present requirements in English, geometry, and the modern languages. In our

judgment better results would be secured in preparation for college if the same amount of work were concentrated upon fewer subjects.

3. Our third position is that the minor differences now existing between colleges in the matter of entrance requirements are detrimental to the best interests of education and should be eliminated. This hardly seems to require argument. When a school is compelled to divide its classes into sections according to the colleges its students wish to enter, or when a class is compelled to cover a greater amount of ground in order to meet the requirements of different colleges, the efficiency of the school and the thoroughness of the work done are certain to suffer. Few schools are so equipped that they can meet these varying demands without a distinct sacrifice of efficiency and without an undue and unnecessary increase of expense. To secure more thorough preparation, our colleges should eliminate these minor differences and agree upon an identical statement of requirements in the different subjects. Some progress has been made of late years in removing these differences, but they still exist to such an extent that the unity of the student's course is greatly impaired.

4. Serious criticisms have been made as to the character and scope of the requirements in certain subjects, as, for example, in physics, geometry, history, and English. In our judgment these criticisms are serious enough to call for the careful reconsideration of such requirements by properly constituted committees. These committees should consist, on the part of the colleges, of specialists in the subjects concerned, and, on the part of the schools, of headmasters, who know the claims of other subjects, and can measure the demands made upon the students by the total amount of entrance requirements.

As stated in the first part of this report, we do not offer a final answer to the questions submitted to us, but express opinions only on those points that we have been able to consider adequately. Several important matters remain that are worthy of most careful investigation. Among these we mention especially the satisfactory measurement of the quantity of college entrance requirements in terms of school work. This involves agreement upon a unit of measurement and the establishment of a scale of values by which any particular requirement or set of requirements can be measured. The Carnegie Foundation, which is rapidly be-

coming one of the potent educational forces of the country, has established such a scale to aid it in its own work and is now co-operating with the College Entrance Examination Board and other agencies in the attempt to perfect a scheme of measurement which may be generally accepted. The establishment and general acceptance of such a scale of values will be a distinct assistance in the consideration of such questions as those now before us. In this connection we commend for careful consideration the plan that has been suggested of forming an authoritative commission to investigate thoroughly and to report upon the amount of work that we may reasonably expect to be done in our schools; for what the colleges may reasonably demand can only be fairly measured by what the schools can adequately supply.

We may also record the fact that the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools a year ago appointed a committee similar to our own to consider the same question. At the recent meeting of the Association this committee made a report of progress, emphasizing especially the differences in the requirements of different colleges, and will continue its investigations for another year.

To recapitulate, our four resolutions are as follows:

1. The amount of work that may be demanded for admission to college is measured by what can be done in an efficient four-year high school course.
2. In our judgment, better results would be secured in preparation for college if the same amount of work were concentrated on fewer subjects.
3. The minor differences now existing between colleges in the matter of entrance requirements are detrimental to the best interests of education and should be eliminated.
4. In our judgment, criticisms on special subjects are serious enough to call for the careful reconsideration of such requirements by properly constituted committees.

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON FARRAND,

Newark Academy, Chairman.

HERMAN V. AMES,

University of Pennsylvania.

GEORGE P. BRISTOL,

Cornell University.

GEORGE R. CARPENTER,
Columbia University.
IRA REMSEN,
Johns Hopkins University.
JAMES M. TAYLOR,
Vassar College.
HENRY D. THOMPSON,
Princeton University.
JULIUS SACHS,
Teachers' College.
EDWARD J. GOODWIN,
Packer Institute, Brooklyn.
DAVID A. KENNEDY,
Dearborn-Morgan School, Orange.
WALTER R. MARSH,
St. Paul's School, Garden City.
WILLIAM L. SAYRE,
Central Manual Training High
School, Philadelphia.

THE PRESIDENT.—The report of this committee is before the meeting for action. It is moved that the report of the committee be accepted and adopted. As many as are in favor of the adoption of this report please say "Aye;" those opposed, "No." It is adopted.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR.—I move that the committee be continued for one year to complete its work.

THE PRESIDENT.—It is moved and seconded that this committee be continued for one year to continue its work. As many as are in favor will please say "Aye;" contrary minded, "No;" it is a vote. The committee, then, stands with the same membership, continued for another year.

It seems to me it might be well to open the report of this committee for general discussion—not for the same reason, quite, but because this subject is really so near and dear to us all. This is the enemy—the overcrowding of the curriculum in the work of the secondary school, quantitative excesses, the fatty degeneration of our secondary school work. I shall hope that those who feel inspired (as we all do) will say something about it.

PROF. LOUIS BEVIER, JR.—I rise simply to ask a question: What measures would Mr. Farrand suggest for the study of the particular entrance requirements which he singles out as needing revision? Is there any additional machinery that ought to be set in motion?

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND.—There is plenty of machinery; the trouble is to get it working without conflict. The organization of such committees as has been suggested is a difficult and complicated matter. They must, in the first place, be broad in their scope. Any committee that is going to make definite recommendations in regard to the requirements in Latin or in English must represent the whole country, and not one particular section. In the next place, it must be representative of the different interests concerned, of the different colleges and different kinds of colleges, of the different schools and different classes of schools. How to secure the appointment of such committees is an extremely delicate and difficult matter. There is no body in existence that can simply say, "Thus shall a committee be constituted." The College Entrance Examination Board has in certain subjects undertaken part of the work, or, at least, has undertaken the initiative, and it has found itself in very troubled waters. There has recently been at work a commission on the subject of physics, and the question of how to secure the appointment of a committee that should be representative was a very troublesome one. Those of us who were engineering the matter found all sorts of difficulties. When we finally thought that we had found a satisfactory plan, and had carried it out, we were told that the result was that the committee was entirely unrepresentative. The general plan adopted was that this and the other Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools should each appoint delegates representing both the colleges and the schools, and that, if possible, the national learned Associations should appoint a certain number of representatives. By learned Associations I mean such organizations as the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association. We have found, however, that there is no one plan that can be adopted that will answer in regard to all subjects. For example, the American Physical Society, if that is the title, declined to appoint repre-

sentatives, because it said that it had no interest in the teaching of elementary physics. It was interested in the subject itself, and in extending the domain of physical knowledge. I am simply indicating to you some of the difficulties that arise. There is no plan that can be followed in all cases; it has to be modified according to the necessities of the particular case.

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS.—I think I am voicing the opinion of some of the other members; I should like to hear from some of the colleges that are represented here today, how they feel with respect to the one point on which the committee have laid considerable emphasis. It would be greatly to the interests of all concerned if the minor variations in statement of entrance requirements were removed by the adoption of identical statements on the part of the various colleges.

To us, that seems a matter of supreme importance; but we could not insist upon it. It is for the college presidents to say whether such a matter is feasible, and whether it would in any way defeat the special objects of the college in formulating its requirements. It is a matter of extreme importance to the progress of this question.

PROFESSOR MURRAY P. BRUSH, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.—A year or two ago a committee of the Johns Hopkins Faculty in charge of undergraduate work took up this question of entrance examinations and what should be required of the men who were coming in. The members of this committee investigated the question very thoroughly and went over the entrance requirements of a great many colleges; then we tried to pick out requirements which should correspond in the main, or be an average requirement, for most of the colleges in the country. Those requirements were then fixed in terms of hours or of pages of work in language, and of certain amounts of other subjects, so that the schools preparing for one college would not have to change their courses to prepare for the Johns Hopkins. In making up these entrance requirements, it did not seem to be a very difficult matter to allow certain substitutions; the head of the Latin department, for instance, wanted the men to have read about so much Latin, and he did not care especially whether they had read Cæsar, Cicero, and Virgil, or whether they had read some Livy and some

Ovid and other things, but he did want a certain ability, so he required so many pages. The same thing is true in the modern languages. In mathematics the requirements are more generally fixed. I think if the colleges in general could make their entrance requirements a little more elastic, so that the preparatory schools could prepare a certain amount of a subject, without being required to prepare any particular texts (I speak from the standpoint of a language man), that this question would naturally solve itself. I do not think there would be any great difficulty in preparing students to pass examinations on certain points of the different subjects, and if the requirements were confined to the regular, old-time subjects, we might say, of Latin, mathematics, Greek or the modern languages, and English, then a certificate in other subjects might be required, I mean a certificate that they had been studied might be required, but it would not be necessary for the candidate to pass an examination in them. That is, the preparatory schools would be at liberty to teach the natural sciences or their modern languages as they pleased. It really seems, after all, as if Latin, mathematics and English are the backbone of the preparatory instruction and all that should be absolutely required for matriculation.

PROFESSOR SPENCER TROTTER, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.—The remarks that have been made in regard to the elimination of a number of the studies required for entrance at college, appeal to me very strongly and, I think, to a good many, in the line of science. I much prefer to take students who have no knowledge of physiology whatever, as gained in the Preparatory Schools, and not worry along with students who have been *supposedly* prepared in physiology for entrance.

The same is true of zoology, in large measure, though I am speaking now especially of physiology. I think we can do better in college with students who have had little if any preliminary training in the study of physiology by carrying them along, say the first three months in preliminaries, and then cutting deeper into the subject along the lines of higher work. I have found repeatedly in my experience with students, especially in physiology, that the problem is to get the students into a deeper understanding of the subject at the beginning. When they come "prepared" from schools they don't seem to have that clear understanding of

the subject that will lead them on in a short time to take up the deeper problems. The same is true, I think, of physics. I have talked with our professor at Swarthmore, who holds much the same view. We prefer to start the students raw, without any knowledge whatever—any preliminary knowledge. We all know, in this State at least, how a beautiful study has been ruined by its stalking-horse qualities on the temperance question.

PROFESSOR C. W. PRETTYMAN, DICKINSON COLLEGE.—I think Dr. Sachs has not yet been answered. I wish to answer the question which he asked of the colleges—whether they would like a definite entrance requirement in specific subjects. My own subject is German. I shall, as a member of the college Faculty, welcome a very definite and specific requirement laid down by some one in authority. Having to face this problem every year, I shall be very glad of a specific requirement laid down by some such board as is here suggested this morning.

THE PRESIDENT.—Seventy-five per cent. of all the teachers in this country are women; and 99½ per cent. of all the good teachers are women. Would not some woman like to speak? The Association has only one more piece of business, but it is nearly half an hour ahead of time. I will, however, close this part of the session and proceed to the Business meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

First Session, Friday, November 27th.

The president appointed the following temporary committees:

On Nominations: President John H. Harris, Bucknell University; Director James C. Mackenzie, Mackenzie School; Principal W. R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy; Superintendent Randall Spaulding, Montclair, N. J.; Headmaster Frederick Gardiner, Yeates School.

On Audit: President James D. Moffatt, Washington and Jefferson College; Professor George P. Bristol, Cornell University.

Fourth Session, Saturday, November 28th.

PROF. GEORGE P. BRISTOL, Cornell University: I move that the thanks of this Association be extended to the authorities of Franklin and Marshall College for the very kind and generous hospitality which they have so fully bestowed upon us.

The motion was carried.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

DR. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Treasurer, read his report, as follows:
To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

GENTLEMEN: I present herewith my report of the condition of the treasury of your Association for the year 1907-08, as embodied in the accompanying statement of receipts and disbursements, with the necessary vouchers.

The receipts for the year amounted to \$1,485.37, and the disbursements to \$1,011.83, leaving in my hands today a balance of \$473.54, to which will be added, in January next, on the certificate of deposit in the Farmers Trust Company, of Lancaster, Pa., of \$400, the sum of \$14 making the entire amount of balance in my hands for the coming year \$487.54. The expenses of the Association again somewhat exceeded the income from membership dues, so that this balance is \$117.83 less than the balance reported last year.

I append a summary of receipts and disbursements, as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand November 29, 1907.....	\$587 87
Interest on certificate of deposit.....	17 50
Membership dues for 1905-06, 1 school.....	5 00
Membership dues for 1906-07, 7 schools	35 00
Membership dues for 1907-08, 166 schools.....	830 00
Membership dues for 1908-09, 2 schools	10 00

Amount of receipts.....\$1,485 37

DISBURSEMENTS.

For Executive Committee expenses.....	\$101 33
For reporters, clerks and stenographers.....	143 00
For postage and expressage.....	110 50
For printing	456 40
For Board of College Entrance Requirements.	28 40
For salaries	150 00
For National Conference on Relations of Col- leges and Schools	17 20
For overpaid dues returned.....	5 00

Amount of disbursements\$1,011 83 1,011 83
 Leaving in my hands a balance of.... 473 54

The accounts balancing \$1,485 37

Of the Colleges and Schools holding membership in your Association, one has paid no dues for 1905-06, five for 1906-07, and sixteen for 1907-08. Of this amount of \$110 possibly the greater part will be paid during the coming year.

Against the balance above stated the Treasurer has in his hands bills which were presented too late to be embodied in this report aggregating \$31.35.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. KIEFFER, *Treasurer.*

Lancaster, Pa., November 27, 1908.

THE PRESIDENT.—You have heard the Treasurer's report; what is your pleasure?

PROFESOR BRISTOL.—I beg leave to say, as one member of the Committee of Audit, that the report has been examined and found correct, and I would move the acceptance of the Treasurer's report.

The report was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Secretary then presented the report of the Executive Committee, as follows:

The Executive Committee reports that the following schools have been admitted to membership since the last convention:

Stuyvesant High School, New York City; Swarthmore High School, Swarthmore, Pa.; St. Agatha, New York City; Miss Madeira's School for Girls, Washington, D. C.; John F. Maher School, Philadelphia; The Ethical Culture School, New York City.

The following schools have resigned membership:

The Allegheny Preparatory School, Allegheny, Pa.; Miss Ely's School, Greenwich, Conn.; The Cutler School, New York City.

The following committee was appointed to call together the colleges of the Middle States who may wish to join in the organization of a College Entrance Certificate Board:

Prof. Edwin S. Crawley, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; President Rush Rhees, Rochester University; Dr. John D. Van Meter, Woman's College of Baltimore.

The following five representatives of the secondary schools were also appointed on the above board:

Principal W. W. Birdsall, High School for Girls, Philadelphia; Dr. William R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy, Pittsburg; Director Francis R. Lane, Tome Institute, Port Deposit; Principal J. M. Green, New Jersey State Model School; Principal W. B. Gunnison, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A committee consisting of six representatives of the secondary schools and six representatives from the colleges was appointed to consider the whole question of entrance requirements.

Those appointed from the colleges were as follows: Prof. George P. Bristol, Cornell University; Prof. Henry D. Thompson, Princeton University; Dr. Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania; President James M. Taylor, Vassar College; President Ira Remsen, Johns Hopkins University; Prof. George R. Carpenter, Columbia University.

Those appointed from the secondary schools were as follows: Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, chairman; Dr. E. J. Goodwin, New York State Education Department; Prof. Julius Sachs, Teachers' College; Principal Walter R. Marsh, St. Paul's School, Garden City, L. I.; Dr. William L. Sayre, Central Manual Training High School, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. D. A. Kennedy, Dearborn-Morgan School.

Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Principal Frank Rollins, of the Stuyvesant High School, were appointed as representatives of the Association to a Conference Committee on the Physics Requirements for Entrance to College, called by the Entrance Examination Board.

The Executive Committee, in order to prevent the loss of the services of Mr. Croswell to the College Entrance Examination Board, formally requested the president to reappoint Mr. Croswell.

On motion of the Secretary it was decided to print the names of the members of the Association in the Proceedings alphabetically, instead of arranging them by geographical location, as at present.

The report of the Executive Committee was on motion accepted.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE.

The Nominating Committee reported as follows:

As officers of the Association for the ensuing year we suggest the following gentlemen:

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1908-1909.

President

President JAMES D. MOFFAT, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN S. STAHR, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

President JOHN H. FINLEY, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Dean JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Principal JOHN C. SHARPE, Blair Academy, Blairstown, N. J.

Director THOMAS S. BAKER, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.

Secretary

Prof. ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Prof. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary, and Treasurer, *ex officio*.

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Principal E. M. HARTMAN, Franklin and Marshall Academy, Lancaster, Pa.

Principal JOHN H. DENBIGH, Morris High School, New York City.

Principal EDWARD RYNEARSON, Central High School, Pittsburg, Pa.

On motion the report was accepted and the secretary was instructed to cast one ballot for the officers as named in the report. They were accordingly elected.*

On motion the President was empowered to appoint six representatives of the preparatory schools on the College Entrance Certificate Board.

He then appointed the following representatives: To serve one year: Principal Stanley Yarnall, Germantown Friends' School, of Philadelphia; Principal W. B. Gunnison, Erasmus Hall High School, of Brooklyn; Principal J. M. Green, New Jersey State Normal School. To serve two years: Principal W. R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy, of Pittsburg; Principal Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann High School, of New York; Principal H. W. Dutch, Montclair High School.

*Mr. Ryneerson resigned from the committee on account of inability to attend the meetings, and Dean Edward H. Griffin, of Johns Hopkins University, was appointed to fill the vacancy.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS IN ENGLISH.

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND.—In the absence of Professor Stoddard, I rise to make a report of progress. The three delegates from this Association were Professor Stoddard, Professor Baker, of Columbia, and myself. We met with the delegates from the other associations on February 21 and 22 of last year. The conference found that the work before it was a very large one. It felt that the time had come to take up the whole question of the English requirement from the foundation, and it found that it could not complete its work at that time. It therefore made for the year 1912 very slight changes in the requirement—simply one or two minor substitutions in the books. I will not read the full list, but submit it in printed form. The conference then adjourned for one year, to meet on the 22d of February next, and appointed a sub-committee consisting of Professor Cross, of Yale; Professor Henneman, of the University of the South; Professor Baker, of Columbia; Mr. Giles, of Michigan, and myself, to investigate thoroughly the whole question, to secure information and advice from colleges and schools; and at the meeting on February 22 the conference will take up the question of a complete revision of the requirement.

At this time, therefore, sir, the only thing that we have to report is progress in our work, and that the work will not be completed until February next.

The formal printed report is as follows:

The conference voted that the following requirements for the year 1912 should be recommended to the constituent bodies for adoption:

NOTE.—*No candidate will be accepted in English whose work is notably defective in point of spelling, punctuation, idiom, or division into paragraphs.*

a. READING AND PRACTICE.—A certain number of books will be recommended for reading, nine of which, selected as prescribed below, are to be offered for examination. The form of examination will usually be the writing of a paragraph or two on each of several topics, to be chosen by the candidate from a considerable number—perhaps ten or fifteen—set before him in the examina-

tion paper. The treatment of these topics is designed to test the candidate's power of clear and accurate expression, and will call for only a general knowledge of the substance of the books. In every case knowledge of the book will be regarded as less important than the ability to write good English. In place of a part or the whole of this test, the candidate may present an exercise book, properly certified to by his instructor, containing compositions or other written work done in connection with the reading of the books. In preparation for this part of the requirement, it is important that the candidate shall have been instructed in the fundamental principles of rhetoric.

1912:

Group I (two to be selected).

Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, *Henry V.*, *Julius Cæsar*, *Merchant of Venice*, *Twelfth Night*.

Group II (one to be selected).

Bacon's *Essays*; Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress*, Part I; *The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers* in the *Spectator*; Franklin's *Autobiography*.

Group III (one to be selected).

Chaucer's *Prologue*; Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, Book I; Pope's *The Rape of the Lock*; Goldsmith's *The Deserted Village*; Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, First Series, Books II and III, with especial attention to Dryden, Collins, Gray, Cowper, and Burns.

Group IV (two to be selected).

Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield*; Scott's *Ivanhoe* and *Quentin Durward*; Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*; Thackeray's *Henry Esmond*; Mrs. Gaskell's *Cranford*; Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities*; George Eliot's *Silas Marner*; Blackmore's *Lorna Doone*.

Group V (one to be selected).

Irving's *Sketch Book*; Lamb's *Essays of Elia*; De Quincey's *Joan of Arc* and *The English Mail Coach*; Carlyle's *The Hero as Poet*, *The Hero as Man of Letters*, and *The Hero as King*; Emerson's *Essays*, selected; Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies*.

Group VI (two to be selected).

Coleridge's *The Ancient Mariner*; Scott's *The Lady of the Lake*; Byron's *Mazeppa* and *The Prisoner of Chillon*; Palgrave's *Golden Treasury*, First Series, Book IV, with especial attention to Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley; Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient*

Rome; Poe's *Poems*; Lowell's *The Vision of Sir Launfal*; Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum*; Longfellow's *The Courtship of Miles Standish*; Tennyson's *The Princess*; Browning's *Cavalier Tunes*, *The Lost Leader*, *How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix*, *Evelyn Hope*, *Home Thoughts from Abroad*, *Home Thoughts from the Sea*, *Incident of the French Camp*, *The Boy and the Angel*, *One Word More*, *Hervé Riel*, *Pheidippides*.

b. STUDY AND PRACTICE.—This part of the examination presupposes the thorough study of each of the works named below. The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure. In addition, the candidate may be required to answer questions involving the essentials of English grammar, and questions on the leading facts in those periods of English literary history to which the prescribed works belong.

The books set for this part of the examination will be :

1912:

Shakespeare's *Macbeth*; Milton's *Comus*, *L'Allegro*, and *Il Penseroso*, or Tennyson's *Gareth and Lynette*, *Lancelot and Elaine*, and *The Passing of Arthur*; Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America*, or Washington's *Farewell Address* and Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration*; Macaulay's *Life of Johnson*, or Carlyle's *Essay on Burns*.

On motion the report was accepted.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATE OF THE ASSOCIATION TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

THE SECRETARY.—This report has been sent by Prof. Herman V. Ames, the representative of the Association to the Conference Committee on Standards of College and Secondary Schools, who is unable to be present. It is as follows:

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

As a representative of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland to the recent conference of representatives of various other associations of colleges and preparatory schools, and other similar bodies, held in New York, April 17, at the office of the Carnegie Foundation, I have the honor to make the following report:

Representatives were present from all the associations and boards comprising the membership of the committee, as appears in the accompanying copy of the Constitution, with the exception of that of the College Entrance Certificate Board of the Middle States and Maryland, which has not as yet been organized.

A constitution which had previously been drawn by a committee composed of Mr. George F. MacLean, of Iowa State University; Mr. Wilson Farrand, of the College Entrance Examination Board, and myself, after slight amendments, was adopted, and is herewith submitted. A permanent organization was effected and the following officers chosen: President George F. MacLean, of Iowa State University, as President, and Mr. Wilson Farrand, of the College Entrance Examination Board, as Vice-President, and Dean Fredrick C. Curry, of Williams College, as Secretary and Treasurer, representing the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools.

You will note that the name of the committee was changed to that of The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The other provisions of the Constitution are, I think, sufficiently clear not to require any explanation. I would, however, call your attention to Article VI of the Constitution, which provides that each organization connected with the committee should contribute \$10 annually to meet its incidental expenses. I suppose that this provision of the report would need to be approved by your Executive Committee.

The minutes of the further action of the committee will shortly be printed and, as soon as received, will be forwarded to you. It was the opinion of the various persons present that this committee has a very important mission to perform in connection with the objects stated in Article II of its Constitution.

Respectfully submitted,

HERMAN V. AMES.

The report was on motion accepted. For information of the Association, the Constitution of the conference committee and resolutions passed at the last meeting are printed:

CONSTITUTION.

NAME.

Art. I. The name of this committee shall be The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

OBJECT.

Art. II. The purpose of the committee shall be to consider standards of admission, matters of common interest to universities, colleges, and secondary schools, and such other questions as may be referred to it.

MEMBERSHIP.

Art. III. The committee shall be composed of delegates from the following organizations:

The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, The New England College Entrance Certificate Board, The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, The College Entrance Examination Board, The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, The National Association of State Universities, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and such other organizations as may be elected to membership. The United States Commissioner of Education shall be ex officio a member of the committee.

OFFICERS.

Art. IV. The officers of the committee shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer, who shall be elected annually.

MEETINGS.

Art. V. Meetings of the committee shall be held from time to time at the call of the President. There shall be at least one meeting in each year.

FINANCES.

Art. VI. Each organization holding membership in the committee shall be expected to contribute ten dollars annually to meet its incidental expenses.

QUORUM.

Art. VII. Delegates from a majority of the organizations entitled to representation in the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

AMENDMENT.

Art. VIII. This constitution may be altered or amended at any regularly called meeting of the committee by a vote of two-thirds of the delegates present, each organization represented having one vote.

The following resolutions were passed by the committee:

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this committee, pupils preparing for college should continue work in English and mathematics through the last school year.

Resolved, That the committee respectfully refers to lists of accredited schools prepared by the organizations represented in this committee as lists which it is desirable that colleges should have.

WHEREAS, There is need, in the interest of standardization and of migrating students, of fuller information regarding colleges and universities;

Resolved, That we urge our organizations to collect data concerning, and to study the subject of, the standardization of colleges and universities.

NOTE: The list of approved schools prepared under the auspices of The New England College Entrance Certificate Board may be procured by addressing Professor Nathaniel F. Davis, 159 Brown Street, Providence, R. I. The similar list prepared under the auspices of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools may be obtained by addressing Director George N. Carman, Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATES OF THE ASSOCIATION
TO THE COMMISSION TO REVISE THE
DEFINITION OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR ENTRANCE TO COLLEGE IN
ELEMENTARY PHYSICS.

*To the Association of College and Preparatory Schools of the
Middle States and Maryland:*

In my capacity as delegate appointed by the Association on a Commission to Revise the Definition of the Requirements for Entrance to College in Elementary Physics, I beg to make the following informal report pending the complete report of the commission to the College Entrance Examination Board, by which body it was instituted. Copies of the full report, I presume, will be available to any who may desire them.

The commission consisted of the following delegates: Appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board—Prof. Wallace C. Sabine, Dean of the Graduate School of Applied Science of Harvard University; Prof. Henry S. Carhart, University of Michigan; Prof. Alfred D. Cole, Ohio State University; Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, University of Pennsylvania; Frank Rollins, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Appointed by the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools—President Flavel S. Luther, Trinity College; John W. Hutchins, A. M., Principal of Malden High School. Appointed by the North Central Association—Prof. C. R. Mann, University of Chicago; Prof. H. L. Terry, Inspector of High Schools, Wisconsin. Appointed by the Southern Association—Prof. C. A. Perkins, University of Tennessee. Appointed by the Middle States and Maryland Association to serve in double capacity, representing this Association as well as the College Entrance Examination Board—Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, University of Pennsylvania; Frank Rollins, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Prof. W. C. Sabine was elected chairman, and Mr. John W. Hutchins secretary of the commission.

Preliminary investigations were carried on by several members of the commission endeavoring to learn the wishes of the secondary school teachers of physics. On May 1 and 2 the commission held a session in New York. Resolutions adopted by the

New York Physics Teachers' Association, and also resolutions adopted by the Eastern Association of Physics Teachers were received and considered, as well as certain dissenting minority reports and opinions of members of these associations.

A desire of the secondary schools to secure a clearer outline of topics for study was apparent. The commission also sought to emphasize a general knowledge of the facts and principles of the science. Much time was therefore given to the formation of a "Syllabus of Topics" which should constitute the basis for the individual teacher's selection of the course adapted to his needs. The revised list of experiments excludes the least desirable experiments of the old list.

Freedom in the selection of topics and experiments within certain bounds was acknowledged to be necessary to adapt the course to the needs of the various schools.

The commission therefore recommends the adoption by the College Entrance Examination Board of the following definition of requirements in elementary physics:

PHYSICS.

The course of instruction in physics should include:

(1) The study of one standard text-book for the purpose of obtaining a comprehensive and connected view of the more important *facts* and *laws* of elementary physics.

(2) Instruction by lecture table demonstrations to be used mainly as a basis for questioning upon the general principles and laws of physics and their applications.

(3) Individual laboratory work consisting of experiments requiring approximately the time of thirty double periods. Among the experiments performed by each student there should be thirty not very different from those in the appended list. All divisions of physics should be fairly represented.

The laboratory work forming an essential part of a general elementary course in physics should be conducted with the definite aim of teaching physics as a quantitative science and of training in accurate observation and thought.

Throughout the course special attention should be paid to the common illustrations of physical laws and their industrial applications.

In the solution of the numerical problems, the student should be encouraged to make use of the simple principles of algebra and geometry to reduce the difficulties of solution.

The "Syllabus of Topics" for the classroom and "List of Experiments" for the laboratory are included in the report, and these present in a general way the outline of work that may be covered to advantage in one year. It neither excludes other topics nor requires their complete fulfilment. Since no school would be expected to cover the entire course outlined, twice as many questions will be given on all examinations as any pupil will be required to answer.

Respectfully submitted,

A. W. GOODSPEED.

This report was, on motion, accepted.

THE PRESIDENT.—The Chair has three items of constitutional business to finish. I have now to reappoint Professor Ames as delegate of this Association to the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. I reappoint the Committee on Uniform Requirements in English: Prof. Francis H. Stoddard, Prof. Franklin T. Baker, Mr. Wilson Farrand, who are to go on as indicated in the report offered by Mr. Farrand; and, lastly, with many thanks to the Association for the honor conferred upon me by the Executive Committee, I will constitutionally reappoint representatives of the Association on the College Entrance Examination Board: Mr. J. G. Crosswell, of New York; Mr. Wilson Farrand, of Newark; Mr. J. H. Denbigh, of New York; Mr. E. J. Goodwin, of Brooklyn, and Mr. J. L. Patterson, of Philadelphia. Is there any other business? If not the meeting is adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1907-1908.

President

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN H. HARRIS, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Dean THOMAS M. BALLIET, New York University New York City.

Principal WALTER B. GUNNISON, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Principal CHARLES S. CROSSMAN, Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.

Principal EDWARD C. WILSON, Friends' School, Baltimore, Md.

Secretary

Professor ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Professor JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary and Treasurer, ex-officio.

President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

PROF. NELSON G. MCCREA, Columbia University, New York City.

Principal CHARLES D. LARKINS, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Principal VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Horace Mann High School, New York City.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1908.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF
THE ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS
OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND.

HELD AT THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, NOVEMBER
29-30, 1907.

Response to the address of welcome by President WOODROW
WILSON, Princeton University.

"The Influence of the Present Methods of Graduate Instruction upon the Teaching in the Secondary School." Dean Thomas M. Balliet, New York University; Principal George E. Myers, McKinley Manual Training High School, Washington, D. C.

Discussion: Professor Ernest G. Sihler, New York University; President John H. Harris, Bucknell University; Prof. Julius Sachs, Columbia University.

"Admission to College by Certificate," by President Rush Rhees, University of Rochester.

Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board, by Prof. Edwin S. Crawley, University of Pennsylvania.

General Discussion, by Prof. John K. Lord, Dartmouth College; Prof. Julius Sachs, Columbia University; President Thomas Fell, St. John's College; Prof. John K. Ford, Dartmouth College; Principal Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann High School, New York City; Principal James M. Green, New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.; Dean William H. Crawshaw, Colgate University; Mr. William N. Marcy, Mackenzie School, Dobb's Ferry, N. Y.; Miss Bertha Bass, Wadleigh High School, New York City; Principal William W. Birdsall, High School for Girls, Philadelphia Pa.; Principal Charles D. Larkins, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.; Prof. Henry B. Mitchell, Columbia University; Dr. John T. Buchanan, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

President's Address: "School and College," President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University.

"Preparation for College as a Means of Education," Dr. Thomas S. Baker, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.; Miss Jessie E. Allen, High School for Girls, Philadelphia.

Discussion, by President E. T. Jeffers, York Collegiate Institute, York, Pa.; Prof. William A. Hervey, Columbia University; Mr. James G. Croswell, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1908-9*

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Adelphi College.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clifton Pl., St. James Pl. and Lafayette Av.)	Charles H. Levermore, Ph.D.
Agnes Irwin School.....	Philadelphia (2011 De Lancey Pl.)...	Sophy Dallas Irwin.
Albright College.....	Myerstown, Pa.....	James D. Woodring, D.D.
Alfred University.....	Alfred, N. Y.....	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny College.....	Meadville, Pa.....	William H. Crawford, D.D.
Arundell School for Girls.....	Baltimore, Md. (625 St. Paul St.).....	Elizabeth Maxwell Carroll.
Asbury Park High School....	Asbury Park, N. J....	Frederick S. Shepherd, Ph.D.
Baldwin School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Jane C. Brownell.
Balliol School.....	Utica, N. Y.....	{ Mrs. Louise S. B. Saunders. { Edith Rockwell Hall.
Baltimore City College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Francis A. Soper.
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.).....	William R. King, U.S.N.
Barnard School for Boys.....	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Av.)..	Wm. Livingston Hazen.
Bayonne City High School....	Bayonne, N. J.....	P. H. Smith.
Beaver College.....	Beaver, Pa.....	Rev. Arthur Staples.
Berkeley Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Pl.).....	Julian W. Abernethy, Ph.D.
Bethlehem Preparatory School.	Bethlehem, Pa.....	H. A. Foering.
Birmingham School for Girls.	Birmingham, Pa.....	{ James G. Miller. { Miss N. J. Davis.
Blair Academy.....	Blairstown, N. J.....	John C. Sharpe.
Blairsville College.....	Blairsville, Pa.....	Rev. N. D. Fiscus.
Bordentown Military Inst.....	Bordentown, N. J....	Rev. Thompson H. Landon, D.D.
Boys' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	James Sullivan, Ph.D.
Boys' High School.....	Reading, Pa.....	Robert S. Birch.
Brearley School.....	New York City (17 W. 44th St.).....	James G. Croswell.
Bryn Mawr College.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	M. Carey Thomas, Ph.D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr School.....	Baltimore, Md. (Cathedral and Preston Sts.).....	Edith Hamilton.
Bucknell University.....	Lewisburg, Pa.....	John H. Harris, D.D.
Canisius College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	Rev. Augustine A. Miller, S.J.
Central High School.....	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)...	Robert Ellis Thompson, Ph.D., D.D.
Central High School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	Edward Rynearson.
Central Manual Training High School	Philadelphia (17th and Wood Sts.)...	William L. Sayre, Sc.D.
Chester High School.....	Chester, Pa.....	Joseph G. Smedley.
Chestnut Hill Academy.....	Chestnut Hill, Pa....	James L. Patterson.
Colgate Academy.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	Frank L. Shephardson.
Colgate University.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	George E. Merrill, D.D., LL.D.
College of the City of New York	New York City.....	John H. Finley, LL.D.
College of St. Francis Xavier.	New York City (30 W. 16th St.).....	Rev. D. W. Hearn, S.J.
Collegiate Institute.....	York, Pa.....	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.
Collegiate School.....	New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	L. C. Mygatt, L.H.D.

*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to ensure correct addressing.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1909-10*

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Adelphi College.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clifton Pl., St. James Pl. and Lafayette Av.)	Charles H. Levermore, Ph.D.
Agnes Irwin School.....	Philadelphia (2011 De Lancey Pl.).....	Sophy Dallas Irwin.
Albright College.....	Myerstown, Pa.....	James D. Woodring, D.D.
Alfred University.....	Alfred, N. Y.....	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny College.....	Meadville, Pa.....	William H. Crawford, D.D.
Arundell School for Girls.....	Baltimore Md. (625 St. Paul St.).....	Elizabeth Maxwell Carroll.
Asbury Park High School.....	Asbury Park, N. J....	Frederick S. Shepherd, Ph.D.
Baldwin School.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	Jane C. Brownell.
Baltimore City College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Francis A. Soper.
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.).....	William R. King, U.S.N.
Barnard School for Boys.....	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Av.)..	Wm. Livingston Hazen.
Bayonne City High School....	Bayonne, N. J.....	P. H. Smith.
Berkeley Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Pl.).....	Julian W. Abernethy, Ph.D.
Bethlehem Preparatory School.	Bethlehem, Pa.....	H. A. Foering.
Birmingham School for Girls..	Birmingham, Pa.....	{ James G. Miller. Miss N. J. Davis.
Blair Academy.....	Blairtown, N. J.....	John C. Sharpe.
Blairsville College.....	Blairsville, Pa.....	Rev. N. D. Fiscus.
Bordentown Military Inst.....	Bordentown, N. J....	Rev. Thompson H. Landon, D.D.
Boys' High School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	James Sullivan, Ph.D.
Boys' High School.....	Reading, Pa.....	Robert S. Birch.
Brearley School.....	New York City (17 W. 44th St.).....	James G. Croswell.
Bryn Mawr College.....	Bryn Mawr, Pa.....	M. Carey Thomas Ph.D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr School.....	Baltimore, Md. (Cathedral and Preston Sts.).....	Edith Hamilton.
Bucknell University.....	Lewisburg, Pa.....	John H. Harris, D.D.
Canisius College.....	Buffalo, N. Y.....	Rev. Augustine A. Miller, S.J.
Catholic University of America	Washington, D. C....	Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D.
Central High School.....	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)....	Robert Ellis Thompson, Ph.D., D.D.
Central High School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa.....	Edward Rynearson.
Chester High School.....	Chester, Pa.....	Joseph G. Smedley.
Chestnut Hill Academy.....	Chestnut Hill, Pa....	James L. Patterson.
Colgate Academy.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	Frank L. Shepherdson.
Colgate University.....	Hamilton, N. Y.....	George E. Merrill D.D., LL.D.
College of the City of New York	New York City.....	John H. Finley, LL.D.
College of St. Francis Xavier..	New York City (30 W. 16th St.).....	Rev. T. J. McCluskey, S.J.
Collegiate School.....	New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	L. C. Mygatt, L.H.D.
Columbia Grammar School....	New York City (34 E. 51st St.).....	Francis F. Wilson.
Columbia High School.....	Columbia, Pa.....	Mary Y. Welsh.
Columbia University.....	New York City.....	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D.
Cornell University.....	Ithaca, N. Y.....	J. G. Schurman LL.D.
Country School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	S. Wardwell Kinney.
Dearborn-Morgan School.....	Orange, N. J.....	{ David A. Kennedy, Ph.D. Mrs. Abby B. Morgan.

*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to ensure correct addressing.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Delaware College.....	Newark, Del.....	George A. Harter, Ph.D.
De Witt Clinton High School.	New York City (59th St. and 10th Ave.)	John L. Tildsley.
Dickinson College.....	Carlisle, Pa.....	George Edward Reed, D.D., LL.D.
Eastern District High School..	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Drigg's Ave. and S. 3d St.).....	William T. Vlymen, Ph.D.
Eastern High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. J. Becker.
Easton High School.....	Easton, Pa.....	William A. Jones.
East Orange High School.....	East Orange, N. J.....	Charles W. Evans.
Emma Willard School.....	Troy, N. Y.....	Anna Leach.
Episcopal Academy.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	William H. Klapp, M.D.
Erasmus Hall High School....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Walter B. Gunnison.
Ethical Culture School.....	New York City (Central Park W. and 63d St.).....	William E. Stark.
Franklin and Marshall Acad...	Lancaster, Pa.....	E. M. Hartman.
Franklin and Marshall College.	Lancaster, Pa.....	Rev. H. H. Appel, D.D.
Friends' Central High School..	Philadelphia (15th and Race Sts.).....	{ W. Elmer Barrett. Anna W. Speakman.
Friends' School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	E. C. Wilson.
Friends' School.....	Germantown, Phila. (Coulter St.).....	Stanley R. Yarnall.
Friends' School.....	Washington, D. C. (1809 I St.).....	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Friends' School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	Herschel A. Norris.
Friends' Select School.....	Philadelphia (140 N. 16th St.).....	James S. Hiatt.
Friends' Seminary.....	New York City (226 E. 16th St.).....	Edward B. Rawson.
Gallaudet College.....	Washington, D. C....	Edw. Minor Gallaudet LL.D.
George School.....	George School, Pa....	J. S. Walton, Ph.D.
Georgetown College.....	Washington, D. C....	Rev. Joseph Himmell, S.J.
George Washington University	Washington, D. C....	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Germantown Academy.....	Philadelphia (Gtn.)..	William Kershaw, Ph.D.
Girls' High School.....	Brooklyn N. Y.....	W. L. Felter, Ph.D.
Girls' High School.....	Philadelphia (17th and Spring Garden Sts.)	J. Eugene Baker.
Girls' Latin School.....	Baltimore, Md. (24th and St. Paul's Sts.)	Leonard A. Blue.
Girls' Normal School.....	Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	J. Monroe Willard.
Gunston Hall.....	Washington, D. C. (1906 Florida Ave.)	Mr. and Mrs. Beverly R. Mason.
Halsted School.....	Yonkers, N. Y.....	Mary S. Jenkins.
Hamilton College.....	Clinton, N. Y.....	M. Woolsey Stryker, D.D., LL.D.
Haverford College.....	Haverford, Pa.....	Isaac Sharpless, LL.D.
Haverford School.....	Haverford, Pa.....	Charles S. Crossman.
Hill School.....	Pottstown, Pa.....	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Hobart College.....	Geneva, N. Y.....	Rev. Langdon C. Stewardson LL.D.
Dr. Holbrook's School.....	Ossining, N. Y.....	Dwight Holbrook, Ph.D.
Holman School for Girls.....	Philadelphia (2209 Walnut St.).....	Adèle B. Ebbinghausen.
Holton Arms School.....	Washington, D. C. (2125 S St.).....	{ Mrs. Jessie M. Holton. Miss Caroline H. Arms.
Horace Mann School.....	New York City.....	Virgil Prettyman, Ph.D.
Howard University.....	Washington, D. C....	Rev. Wilbur P. Thirkield, D.D., LL.D.
Irving School.....	New York City (35 W. 84th St.).....	Louis Dwight Ray, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University....	Baltimore, Md.....	Ira Remsen, LL.D.
Kent Place School.....	Summit, N. J.....	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Lafayette College.....	Easton, Pa.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.
Lansdowne High School.....	Lansdowne, Pa.....	Walter L. Philips.
Lawrenceville School.....	Lawrenceville, N. J..	S. J. McPherson, Ph.D.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Lebanon Valley College.....	Annnville, Pa.....	Rev. A. P. Funkhouser.
Lehigh University.....	S. Bethlehem, Pa....	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
Linden Hall Seminary.....	Lititz, Pa.....	Rev. Charles D. Kreider.
Loyola School.....	New York City (65 E. 83d St.).....	Rev. D. W. Hearn, S.J.
McDonogh School.....	McDonogh, Md.....	Sidney T. Moreland.
Mackenzie School.....	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y..	Rev. James C. Mackenzie, Ph.D.
Miss Hills' School for Girls...	Philadelphia (1808 Spruce St.).....	Mrs. Elizabeth Hills Lyman.
Miss Madeira School.....	Washington, D. C. (1326 19th St.)....	Lucy Madeira.
Maher Preparatory School....	Philadelphia (605 Hale Bldg.).....	John F. Maher.
Manhattan College.....	New York City (Grand Boulevard and 131st St.).....	Brother Jerome. Charles D. Larkins.
Manual Training High School.	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	George Washington Ward, Ph.D.
Maryland State Normal School	Baltimore, Md.....	William Mann Irvine, Ph.D.
Mercersburg Academy.....	Mercersburg, Pa....	Henry Waters.
Mohegan Lake School.....	Mohegan, N. Y.....	{ Albert E. Linder. John G. Mac Vicar.
Montclair Military Academy...	Montclair, N. J.....	H. W. Dutch.
Montclair High School.....	Montclair, N. J.....	Albert G. Rau, Dean.
Moravian College.....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	Albert G. Rau.
Moravian Parochial School...	Bethlehem, Pa.....	J. Max Hark, D.D.
Moravian Seminary.....	Bethlehem, Pa.....	
Morris High School.....	New York City (Bos- ton Road and 166th St.)	John H. Denbigh. Francis C. Woodman.
Morristown School.....	Morristown, N. J....	C. F. Brusie.
Mt. Pleasant Academy.....	Ossining, N. Y.....	Rev. John A. W. Haas, D.D.
Muhlenberg College.....	Allentown, Pa.....	L. A. Doren.
Neptune Township High School	Ocean Grove, N. J..	Wilson Farrand.
Newark Academy.....	Newark, N. J.....	W. E. Stearns.
Newark High School.....	Newark, N. J.....	Henry M. MacCracken D.D., LL.D.
New York University.....	New York City.....	
Normal College.....	New York City (Park Av. and 68th St.)	George S. Davis, Ph.D.
Northeast Manual Training High School.....	Philadelphia, Pa....	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Packer Institute.....	Brooklyn, N. Y.....	Edwin J. Goodwin, Ph.D.
Paterson High School.....	Paterson, N. J. (160 Market St.).....	J. A. Reinhart.
Peddie Institute.....	Hightstown, N. J...	Roger W. Sweetland.
Pennsylvania College.....	Gettysburg Pa.....	S. G. Hefelbower.
Pennsylvania State College...	State College, Pa...	E. E. Sparks, Ph.D.
Perkiomen Seminary.....	Pennsburg, Pa.....	Rev. O. S. Kriebel.
Philadelphia Collegiate Insti- tute	Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.).....	Susan C. Lodge.
Pingry School.....	Elizabeth, N. J.....	S. Archibald Smith.
Plainfield High School.....	Plainfield, N. J.....	Lindsey Best.
Polytechnic Prep. School.....	Brooklyn, N. Y. (99 Livingston St.)....	Alvan E. Duerr.
Princeton University.....	Princeton, N. J.....	Woodrow Wilson LL.D.
Rand Collegiate School.....	Trenton, N. J.....	Edwin W. Rand.
(Misses) Rayson's School....	New York City (164 W. 75th St.).....	Amy Rayson.
Red Bank High School.....	Redbank, N. J.....	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Riverview Academy.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y..	J. B. Bisbee.
Rutgers College.....	New Brunswick, N. J.	W. H. S. Demarest, D.D.
Rutgers Preparatory Academy.	New Brunswick, N. J.	Eliot R. Payson, Ph.D.
Rye Seminary.....	Rye, N. Y.....	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Sachs' Collegiate Institute....	New York City (38 W. 59th St.).....	Otto Koenig, J.U.D.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Sach's School for Girls.....	New York City (116 W. 59th St.).....	C. H. Liete.
St. Agatha.....	New York City (257 W. 86th St.).....	Emma G. Sebring.
St. Agnes School.....	Albany, N. Y.....	Catharine Regina Seabury.
St. John's College.....	Annapolis, Md.....	Thomas Fell, LL.D.
St. Lawrence University.....	Canton, N. Y.....	Rev. Almon Gunnison, D.D., LL.D.
St. Luke's School.....	Wayne, Pa.....	Charles Henry Strout.
St. Mary's Hall.....	Burlington, N. J.....	John Fearnley.
St. Paul's School.....	Garden City, L. I.....	Walter R. Marsh.
St. Stephen's College.....	Annandale, N. Y.....	Rev. Thomas R. Harris, D.D.
Shady Side Academy.....	Pittsburg, Pa. (5035 Castleman St.).....	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Shippen School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Alice H. Byrne.
State Model School.....	Trenton, N. J.....	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Staten Island Academy.....	New Brighton, N. Y.	Frederick E. Partington.
State Normal School.....	West Chester, Pa.....	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
(Miss) Stuart's School.....	Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.).....	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Stuyvesant High School.....	New York City (345 E. 15th St.).....	Ernest R. Von Nardroff, Ph.D.
Swarthmore College.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore High School.....	Swarthmore, Pa.....	B. Holmes Wallace.
Swarthmore Preparatory School	Swarthmore, Pa.....	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse University.....	Syracuse, N. Y.....	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Temple College.....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Thurston Preparatory School..	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Alice M. Thurston.
Tome School for Boys.....	Port Deposit, Md.....	Thomas S. Baker, Ph.D.
Union College.....	Schenectady, N. Y.....	Charles Alexander Richmond, D.D.
University of Maryland.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Bernard Carter, LL.D.
University of Pennsylvania....	Philadelphia, Pa.....	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
University of Pittsburgh.....	Allegheny, Pa. (900 Lincoln Ave.).....	Samuel B. McCormick, D.D., LL.D.
University of Rochester.....	Rochester, N. Y.....	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Univ. of the State of N. Y....	Albany, N. Y.....	Frank Rollins.
Ursinus College.....	Collegeville, Pa.....	George L. Omwake, Dean.
Vassar College.....	Poughkeepsie, N. Y....	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Wadleigh High School.....	New York City (114th St. and 7th Av.)...	John G. Wight, Ph.D.
Warren High School.....	Warren, Pa.....	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington and Jefferson Academy	Washington, Pa.....	James N. Rule.
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington, Pa.....	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Washington College.....	Chestertown, Md.....	James W. Cain, LL.D.
Washington School for Boys..	Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)..	Louis L. Hooper.
Wells College.....	Aurora, N. Y.....	Rev. Geo. Morgan Ward, D.D.
West Chester High School....	West Chester, Pa.....	Addison L. Jones.
Western High School.....	Baltimore, Md.....	David E. Weglein.
Western Maryland College....	Westminster, Md.....	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown Boarding School...	Westtown Pa.....	William F. Wickersham.
William Penn High School for Girls	Philadelphia (15th and Wallace Sts.)..	Cheesman A. Herrick, Ph.D.
Wilmington High School.....	Wilmington, Del.....	A. Henry Berlin.
Wilson College.....	Chambersburg, Pa....	M. H. Reaser, Ph.D.
Woman's College.....	Baltimore, Md.....	Rev. Eugene Allen Noble, S.T.D.
Woman's College.....	Frederick, Md.....	Joseph H. Apple.
Wyoming Seminary.....	Kingston, Pa.....	Rev. L. L. Sprague, D.D.
Yeates School.....	Lancaster, Pa.....	Rev. Frederick Gardiner.
Yonkers High School.....	Yonkers, N. Y.....	William A. Edwards.
York Collegiate Institute.....	York, Pa.....	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1909.

- ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Rev. J. F. Dunlap.
 ASSOCIATION INSTITUTE OF WASHINGTON, *Washington, D. C.* Clifford L. Johnson, Myron Jermain Jones.
 ARMY AND NAVY PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Frank G. Sigman.
 ATGLEN HIGH SCHOOL, *Atglen, Pa.* Mr. and Mrs. W. D. Swisher.
 BALTIMORE CITY COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Carl Otto Schoenrich, Francis A. Soper, Principal; B. Wheeler Sweaney.
 BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.
 BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen, Principal.
 BLAIR ACADEMY, *Blairstown, N. J.* John C. Sharpe, Principal.
 BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* James G. Crowell, Master.
 BRISTOL SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Sarah B. Barber, Alice A. Bristol, Principal; L. L. M. Limoges, J. C. Munges, A. Trabue.
 BRYN MAWR COLLEGE, *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Miss Burchinal, Miss Heffner, Miss May.
 BRYN MAWR SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Mary E. Hoyt.
 CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Edith L. Compton, W. F. Dales, Mrs. W. F. Dales, Mildred Dean, Alfred A. Doolittle, Sara P. Lynch, E. J. Noyes, Emily F. Sleman, Elizabeth R. Walton.
 CHEVY CHASE SEMINARY, *Chevy Chase, Md.* Mrs. S. N. Burke, Principal; S. N. Burke, Principal.
 COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York, N. Y.* Lewis F. Mott.
 COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* George B. Carter.
 COLONIAL SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Washington, D. C.* W. P. Davis, Mrs. C. C. Everett, Principal; Jessie Pruman.
 COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York, N. Y.* Thomas S. Fiske, Adam Leroy Jones.
 DELAWARE COLLEGE, *Newark, Del.* George A. Harter, President; W. Owen Sypherd.
 DICKINSON COLLEGE, *Carlisle, Pa.* J. H. Morgan, Geo. Edward Reed, President.
 EAST CAROLINA TEACHERS' TRAINING SCHOOL, *Greenville, N. C.* Robert H. Wright.
 EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Ernest J. Becker, Laura V. DeVolin, Katherine M. Lewis, Sue M. Lohrfinck.
 EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* H. May Johnson, Anna M. McColm, George A. Ross, W. S. Small, Principal; L. Wilkins.
 EASTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Easton, Pa.* E. C. Brinker, Jr., Wesley S. Mitman, S. P. Uhler.
 EAST ORANGE HIGH SCHOOL, *East Orange, N. J.* Charles W. Evans, Principal.
 EPISCOPAL ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Robert Anderson, W. H. Klapp, Headmaster; Jefferson Shiel.

148 *Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools*

- ETHICAL CULTURE SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* William E. Stark, Principal; Mrs. W. E. Stark.
- FLORENCE SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Anna M. Bedinger.
- FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL ACADEMY, *Lancaster, Pa.* Edwin M. Hartman. Principal.
- FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, *Lancaster, Pa.* John B. Kieffer.
- FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Edward C. Wilson, Principal; Mrs. Edward C. Wilson.
- FRIENDS' CENTRAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* W. E. Barrett, Principal; Anna B. Eisenhower, Helen Moore Fogg, Sarah Hall Stirling.
- FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Florence A. Elliott, James S. Hiatt, Superintendent.
- FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mary Sibley Evans, Hortense Herson, Elizabeth E. Marshall, Eleanor M. Pinkham, George H. Sensner, Thomas W. Sidwell, Principal; Mrs. Thomas W. Sidwell, E. R. B. Willis, Mrs. E. R. B. Willis, Alberta Wilson.
- FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del.* Caroline L. Crew, Edith Hubbard, Herschel A. Norris, Principal.
- GALLAUDET COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Percival Hall.
- GERMANTOWN ACADEMY, *Germantown, Philadelphia.* Charles K. Taylor.
- GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Germantown, Philadelphia.* Stanley R. Yarnall, Principal.
- GEORGE SCHOOL, *George School, Pa.* George A. Walton, Joseph S. Walton, Principal.
- GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Rev. Leo T. Butler, S. J.; Rev. John B. Creeden, S. J.; Rev. Daniel I. Cronin, S. J.; Rev. Thomas Addis Emmet, S. J.; Rev. Francis Goldbach, S. J.; Earl John Mohn, Rev. Edmond Walsh, S. J.
- GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Philander Betts, Mitchell Carroll, H. C. Davis, Ernest G. Lorenzo, Charles W. Needham, President; James F. Peake, Charles S. Smith, William R. Vance, Dean; William A. Wilbur, Dean.
- GUNSTON HALL, *Washington, D. C.* Mary Bechtel, Edith M. Clark, Mrs. B. R. Mason, Principal; Ella W. Rous, E. Rathbone-Smith, Mary Evelyn Steger, L. S. Tilton, Anne Dehon Trapier.
- HALSTED SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* Mary Sicard Jenkins, Principal.
- HAVERFORD COLLEGE, *Haverford, Pa.* Isaac Sharpless, President.
- HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Eugene Baker, Principal; Lydia T. Boring, C. Edna Bramble, Louise H. Haeseler, Sarah P. Miller, Katherine E. Puncheon, Amelia C. Wight, Evaline Young.
- HOLTON-ARMS SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Clara Wilson.
- HORACE MANN SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* Virgil Prettyman, Principal.
- HOWARD UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Percy B. Perkins, R. E. Schuh, Wilbur P. Thirkield, President.
- INGLESIDE SEMINARY, *Washington, D. C.* Mary D. Chesworth Turner, Principal.
- INSTITUTE OF MUSICAL ART, *New York, N. Y.* Edward A. Crossmann.
- JACOB TOME INSTITUTE, *Port Deposit, Md.* Mrs. I. T. Bagley, Thomas Stockham Baker, Director.

- JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* Murray Peabody Brush, Edward Franklin Buchner, Edward H. Griffin, Dean; C. W. E. Miller, G. R. Veazey.
- KENT PLACE, *Summit, N. J.* Mrs. S. W. Paul, Principal; Miss A. S. Woodman.
- KINDERGARTEN NORMAL INSTITUTION, *Washington, D. C.* Susan Plessner Pollock, Principal.
- LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, *South Bethlehem, Pa.* C. L. Thornburg, John L. Stewart.
- LINDEN HALL SEMINARY, *Lititz, Pa.* Charles D. Kreider, Principal.
- MCDONOGH SCHOOL, *McDonogh, Md.* S. T. Moreland, Principal.
- MCKINLEY HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Ida M. Daly, E. M. Coelmun.
- MCKINLEY MANUAL TRAINING SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mary F. Forbes, Wilhelmina Hartmann, Lilian C. McColm, Mary Owen Dean.
- MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Clarence D. Kingsley.
- MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* James G. Miller.
- MISS MADEIRA'S SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Helen J. Robins.
- MISSSES EASTMAN'S SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Annie H. Eastman.
- MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL, *Montclair, N. J.* Maria C. Collins, Harold J. Turner.
- MORRIS HIGH SCHOOL, *New York, N. Y.* John H. Denbigh, Principal.
- NATIONAL CATHEDRAL SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Miss M. Bailey, Sarah Van Gundy, Sarah Pierce Gunnison, Sara Virginia Chaille Handy, Barbour Walker, Mrs. Barbour Walker, Principal.
- NATIONAL PARK SEMINARY, *Forest Glen, Md.* Martha Bomberger, Miss M. L. Gronard, Frederick E. Partington, Headmaster; Charlotte M. Priest, Lena G. Roth, S. B. Stearns, Marian P. Stover.
- NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Wilson Farrand, Headmaster.
- NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, *New York, N. Y.* Francis Hovey Stoddard.
- NEWTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Edith C. Westcott, Principal.
- NORMAL COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York, N. Y.* Edgar Dawson.
- NORRISTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, *Norristown, Pa.* Esther L. Eisenhower.
- PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE, *Gettysburg, Pa.* Karl J. Grimm.
- PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, *State College, Pa.* Judson P. Welsh, Dean.
- PERKIOMEN SEMINARY, *Pennsburg, Pa.* O. S. Kriebel, Principal.
- PHILADELPHIA COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Susan C. Lodge.
- PITTSBURG HIGH SCHOOL, *Pittsburg, Pa.* Edward Ryneerson, Director.
- PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, *Princeton, N. J.* Hardin Craig.
- RIVERVIEW ACADEMY, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Josiah Bartlett.
- RUTGERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Louis Bevier, Jr.
- ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Annapolis, Md.* Thomas Fell, President.
- ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL, *Gordon City, N. Y.* Walter R. Marsh, Headmaster.
- SHADY SIDE ACADEMY, *Pittsburg, Pa.* W. R. Crabbe, Headmaster.
- STATE NORMAL AND MODEL SCHOOL, *Trenton, N. J.* J. M. Green, Principal.
- SWARTHMORE COLLEGE, *Swarthmore, Pa.* Jesse H. Holmes, Joseph Swain, President.
- UNION COLLEGE, *Schenectady, N. Y.* Charles Alexander Richmond, President.

150 *Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools*

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Clarence G. Child,
George E. Fisher, Dean; Arthur H. Quinn.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURG, *Pittsburg, Pa.* Will Grant Chambers, S. B.
Linhart.

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER, *Rochester, N. Y.* John R. Slater.

URSINUS COLLEGE, *Collegeville, Pa.* Homer Smith.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE, *Washington, D. C.* Mrs. George A. Ross.

WASHINGTON SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *Washington, D. C.* Louis L. Hooper,
Headmaster.

WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE, *Washington, Pa.* James D. Moffat,
President.

WELLS COLLEGE, *Aurora, N. Y.* W. P. Thomson.

WEST CHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* Helen L. Hall.

WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* E. M. von Seyfried, Alice L.
Wood.

WESTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* David E. Weglein, Principal.

WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY, *Cleveland, Ohio.* Emma M. Perkins.

WESTTOWN BOARDING SCHOOL, *Westtown, Pa.* Richard C. Brown.

WILMINGTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del.* A. Henry Berlin, Principal.

WILSON COLLEGE, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Sarah Letty Green, Emma C.
Tucker.

WOMAN'S COLLEGE, *Baltimore, Md.* Miss Abel, Leonard A. Blue, Miss
Gardner, E. A. Knapp, John B. Van Meter, Dean.

